

# AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XX. No. 10 }  
WHOLE No. 504 }

DECEMBER 14, 1918

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS  
\$3.00 A YEAR

## Chronicle

**The War.**—The Allied army of occupation has been steadily proceeding without opposition and has reached the Rhine. Advance troops have already

**Military Movements,** taken possession of the three bridge-heads, which according to the terms of the armistice are to be occupied by the Allies and the United States. The British are already in Cologne, the Americans are in Coblenz and the French have arrived in Mainz. The main bodies of the Allied troops are moving forward along the entire front, the British having reached, by December 6, the general line of Rheinbach, Weiler, Wevelinghoven; and the Americans, the general line of Udelhoven, Doeweller, Laubach, Driesch, Todanroth, Ndr Worresbach, coming up to Geldsdorfau, Mayen, Klöng and Schwarben, on December 8. The American generals have steadfastly refused to have any dealings except with the de facto Government, and the French generals, on entering the Palatinate from Lorraine, have exercised the greatest moderation, warning their troops and the native population that scrupulous respect should and would be shown to the rights of all.

President Wilson sailed for Brest, France, in the forenoon of December 4, on the United States steamship George Washington to attend the Peace Conference. He is the first President of the United States to visit Europe during his term of office. The President is accompanied on the trip by Mrs. Wilson. The historic event of the departure of the Chief Executive on what all recognize to be an epoch-making voyage was witnessed by a vast throng assembled on the waterfront of Manhattan and Staten Island to bid him a hearty farewell. The U. S. battleship Pennsylvania and a squadron of destroyers and mine-sweepers will convoy the George Washington across the Atlantic.

**The President Sails for France** The members of the American Peace Commission who sailed with the President are Secretary of State Robert Lansing, and Mr. Henry White. Two members of the Commission, Colonel House and General Bliss are already in Europe. Another member, Mr. Baker, will remain in Washington until the President returns. Together with the Peace Delegates, and attached to the Commission in some official capacity, were Leland Harrison, Assistant Secretary of the Commission; Philip H. Patchin, Assistant Secretary; Sydney V. Smith, Chief of Bureau, Department of State; William McNeir, Chief of Bureau, Department of State; Disbursing Officer of the Commission, George H. Harris; Assistant Disbursing Officer, William C. Bullitt, attached to the Commission; R. O. Sweet, Secretary to Mr. Lansing. The following went as guests of the President: Mr. Jules J. Jusserand, the French Ambassador; Count V. Macchi di Cellere, the Italian Ambassador; Mr. John W. Davis, U. S. Ambassador to Great Britain. A corps of specialists in international law, economical and political questions accompanied the Commission. Among these are Dr. Isaiah Bowman, Territorial Specialist; Allyn A. Young, Specialist on Economic Resources; Charles H. Haskins, Specialist on Alsace-Lorraine and Belgium; Clive Day, Specialist on the Balkans; W. E. Lunt, Specialist on Northern Italy; R. H. Lord, Specialist on Russia and Poland; Charles Seymour, Specialist on Austria-Hungary; W. L. Westermann, Specialist on Turkey; G. L. Beer, Specialist on Colonial History; Dr. S. E. Mezes, President, College of the City of New York. The President and his party are not expected to reach Paris much before Saturday, December 14. The trip, it was announced, was to be made at ordinary cruising speed as there was no occasion for haste. During the voyage the President kept in touch with all questions at home and abroad by wireless.

Representative Carter Glass, of Virginia, was nominated, on December 5, Secretary of the Treasury by President Wilson, to take the place of Secretary McAdoo, who lately resigned. On the confirmation of the nomination by the Senate, which was expected to follow without delay, the new Secretary will assume his duties on December 16. According to a statement made by the retiring Secretary, "The acceptance by Mr. Glass of his new post will give great satisfaction to the whole country. The tremendously important part he had in the formulation and passage of the Federal Reserve act,

**The New Secretary of the Treasury**

his familiarity with banking and economic problems growing out of his long service in the Congress, and for the last six years as Chairman of the important Committee on Banking and Currency have earned for him the confidence of financial and business interests. He has unusual qualifications for the great office to which the President has nominated him." Mr. Glass is known for his initiative, application and courage. He entered political life as member of the Virginia State Senate, and was later a member of the Virginia Constitutional Convention. He is serving his ninth term in Congress, and on November 5 was elected to a tenth. He is the owner of the *Daily News* and the *Daily Advance* of Lynchburg, Va.

The new War Revenue bill, reduced more than \$2,229,026,000 from the estimates passed by the House, was reported to the Senate December 6 by Chairman Simmons of the Finance Committee.

#### *The War Revenue Bill*

The bill provides for a tax levy in 1919 of \$5,953,466,000, and is said to exceed all tax measures in the history of the United States or of any other nation. If passed in its present form the bill will impose on every person in the country a tax of more than \$59.00. The revenues that will be raised under the provisions of the present bill are estimated as follows: Incomes, \$2,207,000,000; war excess profits, \$2,400,000,000; estates or inheritances, \$75,000,000; transportation and insurance, \$229,000,000; beverages, \$450,000,000; tobacco, \$240,600,000; admissions and dues, \$54,000,000; excise taxes, \$123,000,000; special taxes, \$73,866,000; stamp taxes, \$31,000,000; miscellaneous, . . . . .; floor taxes, \$70,000,000; total, \$5,953,466,000. Republican Senate leaders have announced that they will oppose the bill because it also provides that the revenues to be collected in 1920 shall reach about \$4,000,000,000 through the reductions of the proposed higher war profits and income taxes. The signing of the armistice is what brought about the bill's reduction. The estate tax is now \$35,000,000 less than it was in the House bill.

**Germany.**—There is considerable diversity of opinion in Germany as to what should be done with the former Kaiser. The present German Government has as yet no fixed policy on the subject; it is, however, investigating the methods of the Foreign Office previous to the beginning of the war, with a view to determining the responsibility for the outbreak of hostilities. The result of these investigations, it is said, will be published as soon as they have been completed. Hugo Haase, the People's Commissioner for Foreign Affairs at Berlin, is quoted as saying that in his opinion the international odium incurred by the Hohenzollerns will be sufficient punishment for their share in the guilt. On the other hand increasing pressure is being exerted on the Government for more severe treatment, and particularly for the establishment of a "State Court of Justice to try all

those concerned in the conduct of affairs prior to the opening of the struggle"; together with this demand there is another, also growing in strength, that the ex-Kaiser should be demanded from the Dutch Government and delivered over to the German Government. Sporadic demonstrations in favor of the ex-Kaiser have been promptly quelled by the Soviets.

An Associated Press dispatch from London, dated December 3, states that at a meeting held in Downing Street, on December 3, at which the British War Council and representatives from the British Dominions were present, and in which Premier Clemenceau and Signor Orlando, the Italian Prime Minister, participated, but which Mr. House was prevented by illness from attending, arrived at the decision to demand that Holland hand over the former German Emperor and the Crown Prince to the Allies. The same dispatch states, however, that no action will be taken on the matter until the arrival of President Wilson.

Mr. Lloyd George expressed British opinion on the question of punishing the ex-Emperor in a recent speech at Newcastle, in the course of which he said that it was the view of the greatest jurists of England that William Hohenzollern was guilty of an indictable offense for which he should be held responsible, not only for having started the war, but also for the atrocious manner in which it was conducted in defiance of the law of nations: "The Entente Allies have got so to act that men in the future who feel tempted to follow the example of the rulers who plunged the world into war will know what is waiting for them in the end."

Holland has appointed a board of three civilians to determine the status of the former Emperor, but it is understood that the Dutch Government, though disposed to recommend the internment of the royal fugitives in some Dutch colony, will not resist the demand of the Allies and the United States, should these Governments formally demand their extradition.

Both in France and the United States action has been brought by relatives of the victims of submarine warfare, and the law is being studied as to the possibility of demanding the extradition of the ex-Emperor. No decision has been reached but the first steps have been taken towards bringing him to trial.

The demand of Herr Kurt Eisner, the Bavarian Premier, for the retirement of Dr. Solf, Erzberger and Schiedemann, and associates from the Foreign Office

#### *The Separatist Movement*

under threat of breaking off diplomatic relations between Bavaria and Prussia, has not been followed by the elimination of the Foreign Secretary, but has had other results not contemplated by Herr Eisner. It has called forth a storm of criticism against the Bavarian Premier, who now proclaims that he is by no means in favor of a separatist policy, and in Berlin it has been stigmatized as an effort to exculpate Bavaria of its rightful share in bringing on the war, and to throw the entire odium on



Berlin. It is now rumored that Herr Eisner is to be offered Solf's post. Both in Berlin and Munich and elsewhere demands are being made for anticipating the holding of a national assembly at the earliest possible date. Throughout the German States great confusion still continues, and it is stated that the Peace Conference will have to be delayed until something like a stable and responsible government has been created.

**Ireland.**—The only important piece of news that leaked out from Ireland during the week is that twenty-two Sinn Fein candidates have been nominated for Parliament. The last Irish papers that arrived were anxious to know what is to be done for Ireland's self-determination. The United States, at least, is interested in this problem. The archdioceses of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston and San Francisco, and the diocese of Newark, Nashville and St. Augustine petitioned the President to keep Ireland in mind, as did also Mgr. Shahan, rector of the Catholic University. In Boston a monster mass-meeting was held on the Common. His Eminence, Cardinal O'Connell, sent the following letter to the Chairman:

I have received your letter stating that there would be a meeting on Boston Common, Sunday, December 1, in favor of the cause of Ireland's complete freedom and independence as a nation, and inviting me to participate in that meeting.

I am sure that no one can possibly doubt the depth and sincerity of my heart's love for the cradle of my race and the home of my fathers.

From my boyhood days my mind has been saturated with the history of her wrongs, her griefs and her sufferings, through all of which, thank God, she has kept sacred and inviolable the Faith delivered to her by St. Patrick and her eternal devotion and attachment to the Holy See; so that, as one in whose veins flows the purest of Irish blood and as a prelate of the great Church to which the sons of St. Patrick have ever been loyal, I feel it my bounden duty to aid her just and righteous cause in every legitimate way that I can.

But now added to both these considerations is the fact of tremendous importance that the President of the United States has raised the watchword, self-determination for all nations.

Ireland is a nation, one of the oldest in all Europe, and certainly has the very first right to be considered among those for whose liberty, real and genuine, the world of freemen has fought and won.

As an American citizen, therefore, I take my stand with the President of my country in working and praying for complete and entire and unequivocal justice to the Irish nation.

I regret exceedingly that an engagement which I am in nowise able to cancel will prevent my presence at the meeting on the Common, but I feel that such a meeting, conducted for a just cause, under legal auspices and wise and prudent direction, will not fail to express in enlightened and elevated speech the justice of a holy cause.

The week beginning December 8 was self-determination week throughout the country. Mass-meetings were held in many cities, those in New York and Philadelphia being the most noteworthy. At the former the chief speech was given by Cardinal O'Connell, too late, how-

ever, for notice in this issue of AMERICA. The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick and the National Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies' Auxiliary also memorialized the President. On Thursday, December 12, the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held an open session to discuss Ireland's cause. The proceedings, if important, will be presented in a later chronicle.

**Montenegro.**—King Nicholas of Montenegro, with all his family, has been deposed. His flight from his country during the invasion of Austria, and his subsequent capitulation, his resistance to the proposed unification of Montenegro and Serbia, his refusal to abdicate, and the fall of two ministries as the result of this refusal, led to the action of the Skupshtina, the Montenegrin National Assembly, which voted the formal deposition of King Nicholas and the union of Montenegro with Serbia under King Peter. The vote was cast on November 29

**Rome.**—The Holy Father has addressed an Encyclical Letter to the Catholic Episcopate, under the date of December 1, in which he orders that public prayers be offered in every Catholic church throughout the world, in order to ensure Divine guidance for the Commissioners to the Peace Congress, which is to have so large a share in determining the future of the world. After expressing his gratitude to God for the signing of the armistice, and his gratification at the demonstrations of piety which have welcomed the cessation of hostilities, he continues:

There remains now to implore the Almighty that the great gift granted us shall have its crowning, that the delegates of the various nations to meet in solemn congress shall give the world a just and lasting peace. Such grave and complex decisions will have to be taken as no human assembly has ever taken before. Therefore words are wanting to express how greatly the delegates need to be Divinely enlightened so as to be able to accomplish their mission. Their decisions in the highest degree will affect the interest and good of all humanity. Thus, Catholics who favor order and progress must invoke the Divine assistance upon those participating in the Peace Conference. We desire this duty to be recalled to all Catholics.

The Pope ends by pledging the entire weight of his influence to have the decisions of the Conference loyally accepted and carried out by Catholics.

**Spain.**—The new Cabinet which was formed only recently, with the Marquis of Alhucemas as Premier and Count Romanones as Foreign Minister, resigned December 3, having found it impossible to

**Cabinet Crisis** agree on the question of self-government for Catalonia. The preceding Cabinet under Antonio Maura was a coalition cabinet, which was saved from resignation only temporarily by a reorganization which took place on October 4. It was

succeeded by the Liberal Ministry under the Marquis of Alhucemas on November 17. A dispatch from Madrid reports that the following program of constitutional reforms is being actively agitated by the Reformist party:

Any bill rejected by the Crown to become a law without further reference to the Crown if the Parliament reapproves the measure; the royal prerogatives to be exercised under responsibility to the Ministers; the entire Senate to be chosen by the electors; every province which demands autonomy and is in a position to fulfil the necessary conditions to be conceded its demand; military service to be universal and obligatory, with any person exempted paying during the term of service required a tax proportionate to his income; State schools and technical education to be largely increased.

Cabinets in Spain have had a very precarious existence ever since the war began as a result of the divergent sympathies of the people on the war.

**Russia.**—A dispatch dated Stockholm, December 5, states that fugitives who have reached that city from Russia report that "Life in Petrograd is terrible." Flour

**Petrograd Horrors** is selling there for twenty-five rubles (about \$125) for a little more than a pound, and butter and sugar for seventy-five rubles a pound. Herrings at five rubles each are the only food obtainable. All the middle-class people are excluded from the restaurants and are dying of starvation by thousands, hundreds being buried every morning between six and nine o'clock. Only about 500,000 people are left in the city out of a normal population of 2,000,000. Red Guards occupy half the city's flats, hotels and cafés are closed, and the houses of the bourgeoisie are deserted and plundered. The Dutch Minister at Petrograd, who recently arrived in Holland, regards the practical Bolshevism he witnessed in Russia as "the end of civilization." Its principles of government are

High wages for no work, the taking of others' property without punishment, and no taxation. The state of unemployment in Petrograd is terrible. The situation is one of utter exhaustion. The people do not know how they will exist from day to day. Never dreamed of such corruption and tyranny and the absence of all semblance of freedom. The future seems hopeless.

The terrorists at Mohilev have charged with counter-revolutionary plotting and put to death fourteen persons, including Prince Eristoff, his two sisters and the Prince and Princess Sviatopolk-Mirsky. Carl Ackerman writes to the *New York Times* that the situation in the Omsk region is "extremely serious for the Czechs, Russians and Allies." He reports that there is a schism among the Czechs owing to a lack of definite knowledge regarding the United States' intentions. The Czechs can hold out till February, and if by that time they receive war supplies and clothing they will be ready to attack the Bolsheviks.

The *New York Times* lately published a translation and summary of a letter written early last month to the

Berlin *Tageblatt* by Hans Vorst, its Moscow correspondent, in which he describes how the "Extraordinary Commissions" "Extraordinary Commissions for Fighting the Counter-Revolution, Speculation, and Official Criminality" are made up and how they operate. He writes:

These are the active organs of the class struggle and of the terror. Every government and district has its particular "Extraordinary Commission." At the head of them all stands the "Extraordinary Commission of All Russia," under the direction of Dzershinsky and Peters. Here, however, as is the case with all the other Soviet official bodies, it would be wrong to assume that things work on the European plan, i. e., that the branch organizations in the districts were subject to those of the governments, and these, in turn, to the "Commission of All Russia" in Moscow, and that thus the whole thing formed a unified and harmoniously functioning system.

"At present the provinces are to a high degree independent of the central body; each acts on its own account and according to its own judgment, impelled by the desire not to display less "revolutionary energy" than its neighbor. All these "Extraordinary Commissions" are clothed with unlimited power over life and property; they form, because of the considerable number of myrmidons in their service, an important armed force which is under no obligation to do anything but expropriate, confiscate, and execute; they carry out their sad and bloody office, responsible to nobody and subject to nobody, not even to the Soviets or the Commissariats.

In the hands of the "Extraordinary Commissions" lay, and lies, first of all, the practical execution of the red mass terror. And how they have carried out this task is shown by the guaranteed facts coming from Bolshevik sources that I have reported in my accounts of the terror; it is shown by the endless, dreadful lists of those shot. It should be mentioned that the "Extraordinary Commissions" proceed with the same severity as against the bourgeoisie against the abuses and dishonesty existing among the Soviet officials themselves. Among the lists of those shot one occasionally runs across reports like this: "Commissary X. Y., for drunkenness and misconduct," or "Y. Z., member of such and such a Soviet, for drunkenness and other crimes." The list is already lengthy of the Soviet officials who have been shot for bribery and extortion. But in the end the work is almost useless. The temptation is, in view of the high prices and the comparatively low salaries, too strong, the plenitude of power too great, the opportunity for plundering too favorable, and the danger of being discovered too slight, because it is only in the rarest cases that the intimidated victims dare to make a complaint.

And finally, there are not as many convinced communists as there are Soviet officials, nor are there as many as there are employees of the Extraordinary Commissions. The result of this condition is apparent and is openly admitted. Of late the Extraordinary Commissions are publishing their own "weekly," which lays claim to not a little historic interest. In No. 4, which came out yesterday, is found the following sentence, which affords trustworthy evidence: "Reports are coming in from all sides that individuals not only unworthy but actually criminal are trying to get placed with the Extraordinary Government Commissions, and especially with the Extraordinary District Commissions."

The writer reports that more or less successful attempts have been made by the Bolsheviks to secure the cooperation of the "Intellectuals." Maxim Gorky was publicly "reconciled" with the Bolshevik Government at a meeting in Petrograd which was attended by 20,000 people.



# The Irish Issue in Its International Aspect

WILLIAM J. M. A. MALONEY

WHEN France under Napoleon menaced the freedom of the world, Alexander I of Prussia held a position of detachment not unlike that which America's President held on December 18, 1916, while Germany under the latest Hohenzollern was attempting to overwhelm the Allied Powers. Alexander was loath to embroil Russia in a struggle between contending Powers, whose objects in the war "as revealed by their statesmen were virtually the same." But he was not unwilling to help to end all war. So in 1804 he laid down as a maxim to the English Minister, Pitt, that the peace of Europe would never be permanently established "until 'the internal order of every country' should be firmly founded on 'a wise liberty as a barrier against the passions, the unbridled ambitions, or the madness which often drive out of their senses those in whom power is vested.'" He proposed that such States as wisely laid their foundations in liberty should, on the cessation of the war then waging, form a League of Nations, all the members of which would guarantee to each the possessions of each, in order that there might be no "future attempts to disturb the general tranquillity" (Phillips, "The Confederation of Europe," London, pp. 34-38). At that time Ireland had just passed through the rebellion of 1798, the sale of the Irish Parliament by Castlereagh to England (1800), and the Emmet rebellion of 1803. The Irish issue was the obvious test of England's conception of "wise liberty." But without either applying this test or seeking such an adequate guarantee of England's sincerity as the freedom of Ireland would have given him, Alexander entered the war, and was a determining, if not the dominant, factor in the overthrow of Napoleon. When the cessation of hostilities came, although the servitude of Ireland remained as a symbol of oppression, a pledge against peace, the plain people everywhere "promised themselves an all-embracing reform of the political system of Europe, guarantees for peace, in one word the return of the Golden Age" (Gentz, "Congress of Vienna," quoted by Lipson, "Europe in the Nineteenth Century," p. 212). But,

Great Britain was concerned only with an immediate and practical object, the ending of the war. It is clear that the English Minister meant that only France should not be allowed to disturb the future settlement of Europe by "fresh projects of aggrandisement and ambition" (Lipson, *loc. cit.*, p. 212).

The Peace Congress met at Vienna, and, with the nation broker, Castlereagh, acting for Great Britain, resulted in nothing but restorations; agreements between great Powers of little value for the future balance and preservation of the peace of Europe, and quite arbitrary alterations in the possessions of the less important States. No act of higher nature, no great measure for public order or

for universal good, which might make up for Europe's long sufferings or reassure it as to the future, was forthcoming. For the only guarantee of the sincerity of the participants was that given, perforce, by France in her exhaustion.

Since then the periodic cessation of war has come so often to the world that men have lost count of its advent. In every truce, the hopeful have seen again the vision of Isaias, of a world united in peace; and in every fresh outbreak of war men have been lured to death by rulers who promised to pinion peace with their sword. The plain peoples of today in the Allied no less than in the American ranks were led to battle, in order that the supremacy of right over might should be finally vindicated, that small nationalities might thereby be freed from the oppression of usurping Powers, and that henceforth the free peoples of the world might unite in equality as members of a League of Nations, a League which would exercise common political sovereignty solely to the end that war should forever cease. They have won the war, but peace is yet to be won or lost. Dominating the Peace Conference are the Government of America and the Government of the British Empire. America's President before the war, at the acceptance of war, during the war, and since the cessation of hostilities has unequivocally stated his purpose to seek the final elimination of war. Plain peoples of the world believe in him, trust in him, but fear for him lest, like Alexander I of Russia, his purpose be defeated, so that millions of lives must be squandered again to reach this same stage on the road to universal peace. And the basis of their fear is the symbol, Ireland.

The task of the conferring Governments is to restore and to make permanent the peaceful equilibrium of the world. In the past England has been the center of that equilibrium which, when disturbed by Spain, Holland, France or Germany, led Britain to war: and the disturbing elements were thereby reduced to balanced proportions, in leagues, alliances, *ententes*, and associations. England, conqueror of Africa, Palestine, Arabia, Persia, and the German colonies; and possessor of Ireland, Canada, Newfoundland, the West Indies, Australia, New Zealand, India, Ceylon and Burmah, has now become empress of the world. Yet it is actually proposed that she grant self-determination to the world and forego her supremacy in favor of a League of which the component States, small and great, shall enjoy equality with her before the law of nations. In this League each nation will arm for domestic order only, and all will contribute to a common force that will guarantee the world's peace. The unit of State proposed for the League is called a nation. It is implicit in the idea of a unit that it should be indivisible, self-supporting, and able to sustain its share

of the common burden. This unit has been further qualified as constituted by people "governed only by the consent of the governed."

Among the nations of the world the Irish are unsurpassed in the sum of their distinguishing characters of speech, race, customs, and traditions. They take historical precedence over all nations, except the nations of Greece and Italy; they inhabit a country unique in its geographical separateness from all others and greater in area than Greece, Serbia, Switzerland, Denmark, Holland, or Belgium. Ireland contains more people than Greece, Switzerland, Finland, Serbia, Denmark, or Norway. Unless the word nation has lost its traditional significance and has become a term of opprobrium conferred only upon peoples hitherto fighting in the service of the Central Empires, Ireland is a nation. The nationhood of Ireland is not dependent upon admission to any league of Powers. A league avowedly founded on nationhood undermines its own basis by the exclusion of Ireland; and its selective character makes of it merely a league of rulers, an entangling alliance to embroil peaceful members in all the wars on the seven seas.

In less than a century, Ireland, in addition to paying out of her own taxes the whole of her own cost, has been made to pay to the maintenance of the imperial army and navy of England a sum of £325,000,000 (\$1,725,000,000) (Mr. John Redmond, House of Commons, April 11, 1912). Ireland's annual foreign trade, almost exclusively monopolized by England, exceeds that of Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Portugal, Greece, or Serbia, and almost equals the foreign trade of Denmark ("Statesman's Year Book," 1913). The exclusion of a great and historic nation, which is an indivisible State-unit, which even under present conditions is able to pay the sum exacted to support the one imperial navy of the world, and which has a yearly foreign trade of \$737,750,000, would weaken the stability of any aggregation of less compact States, increase the pro-rata burden borne by the selected members for the support of the League, and deprive the League of a considerable part of the world's commerce.

The inclusion of Ireland as a nation would mean the loss to England of her most treasured possession. True, a war has just been fought in which English statesmen from Sir Edward Grey to Mr. Lloyd George have avowed their essential purpose to be the freedom of small nations. But in a war between empires a subject nation forms a part where each empire is vulnerable, and where the victor can conveniently disarticulate the vanquished. A subject nation, such as Czecho-Slovakia, that has the happiness to have been a component part of a defeated and dismembered empire thereby receives at least titular freedom. A subject nation such as Ireland, that has the misfortune not to have been a component part of the conquered Empire, receives the treatment Ireland is now receiving. To give moral sanction to the freeing of Poles, Czecho-Slovaks, and other peoples lately subject to Ger-

many or Austria, either the victorious Empire itself must free Ireland or else those other nations which associated themselves with England and were privileged to devote their lives, their honor, and all they were and had to the avowed purpose of the war, must decree the freedom of Ireland from England, as in 1831 the freedom of Belgium from Holland was decreed. In any event, the exclusion of Ireland must mean the exclusion of England, too, from a league of free peoples, of peoples "governed only by the consent of the governed." For an England dragging in chains the nation of Ireland "could not be trusted to keep faith within the league or to observe its covenants."

Besides moral sanction, a League of Nations will need the sanction of force.

It will be absolutely necessary that a force be created, as a guarantor of the permanency of the settlement so much greater than the force of any nation now engaged in any alliance hitherto formed or projected, that no nation, no probable combination of nations could face or withstand it. (January 22, 1917, "Message to the Senate.")

Force can be created, but it cannot be thriftily or effectively applied except through the control of strategic bases. Concerning Ireland as a base, the British "Navy League"—"from which the German Navy League drew its impulse" (Mahan, "America's Interest in International Conditions," p. 171)—in a manifesto issued on January 10, 1918, stated:

Before the great war the security of the Irish ports was wrongly regarded by the majority of the British people as a partisan British interest. The scales fell from our eyes after war broke out: *A clear vision of the sacrifices of great and small nations fighting for freedom revealed the relation between Ireland and world trade. The strategic unity of the British Isles is a world problem not merely a British interest.* The trade of Europe with Canada, the United States, the West Indies, the Gulf of Mexico, the Panama Canal, the Caribbean Sea, all the Republics of South America, all the States of the Australian Commonwealth, New Zealand, China, Japan, Russia in the Pacific, India, Ceylon, and Africa are dependent directly upon the control of Irish seaports and the communications behind them. The British people before the war were mistaken in regarding Queenstown, Bantry Bay, Valentia, and Lough Swilly as merely British interests. Ireland has eighteen harbors, five of them first-class. The best of them face the Atlantic Ocean which floats the trade of the world. *Friendly naval control of Irish harbors by free nations is essential to the freedom of the world.* The ocean of the air, the surface of the sea, and underwater attack or defense will be controlled . . . from Irish Western ports.

Even if the League create a navy so large that the burden of its support would strain the loyalty of the members, the strategic position of Japan with her ally England, acting from Ireland as a base, would enable these Powers together to defy any force that the League might bring against them. So long as Ireland is controlled by England the equilibrium of the world will remain centered on her, and a League of Nations will exist at her pleasure as an auxiliary to her purpose. Ireland a Heligoland of the Atlantic, would menace the Atlantic coast of the American Continent from Punta Arenas in Patagonia to



*Quebec. Therefore naval control of Ireland by a naval representative of the free nations of the world is essential to the freedom of the world. Ireland is truly the key of the Atlantic, a fortress that guards the main trade routes of the world. (Loc. cit., Jan. 10, 1918.)*

A free Ireland, as is so eloquently and conclusively shown by the British Navy League, is a member essential to any league of nations. It is, indeed, the one indispensable member, the member vital to the League, the member whose absence would leave undetermined only the moment of the League's disintegration, only the name of the Power which would next dare to disturb the possessor of Ireland, the center of the world's equilibrium. Without a free Ireland, the force of the League cannot control the world: without such controlling force there can be no League of Nations; without a League of Nations there can be no permanent peace; and without permanent peace plain peoples have been privileged to dedicate their lives and possessions to what? The freedom of Ireland will be the sign of the freedom of the world from war. Is there any guarantee that this sign will be given to the world?

America, presuming that her associates at least "were as candid and straightforward as the momentous issues involved required," did not deem it necessary "to assure herself of the exact meaning of the note of" acceptance of England's Government before the armistice was signed. America likewise did not deem it necessary "in order that there might be no possibility of misunderstanding very solemnly to call the attention of" the Government of England "to the evident principle which runs through the whole American program." It is contained in the "Address to Congress" of January 8. "It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities and their right to live on terms of liberty and safety with one another whether they be strong or weak." Yet even when the armistice was being signed England was affirming, as throughout the war England has affirmed, and as she is today affirming by all the ways an autocratic empire can affirm it, her complete consciousness of the distinct national entity—Ireland. In the Peace Conference "the good faith of any discussion manifestly depends upon the consent" of his Britannic Majesty's Government "immediately to withdraw its forces everywhere from the invaded territory" of Ireland; to liberate those whom by deportation and imprisonment England has recognized as the leaders of the Irish nation; and to permit the people of Ireland freely to determine by plebiscite the form of their government. No such guarantee of good faith was required from, or proffered by, England: and she reserved the question of the freedom of the seas for discussion. As it was in 1814, so in 1918 "it is clear that Great Britain was concerned only with an immediate and practical object, the ending of the war." The English Minister meant that only "Germany" should not be allowed to disturb the future settlement of Europe by fresh projects of aggrandisement and ambition."

Just as America enters the Peace Conference, Ireland

entered the war without guarantees of good-faith from England. Ireland had no shipping vainly seeking passage through forbidden seas. The only invader on Irish soil was England. And Ireland refused to be terrorized into war by fear of facing unaided the remote contingency of invasion by Germany. According to J. I. C. Clarke, 480,000 Irishmen fought and died for France between 1690 and 1792. The only entry on the other side of the ledger was the 280 Frenchmen lost by Humbert in the Rebellion of 1798. Belgium in the eighty-three years of her existence had spared not a man, a dollar, or an audible articulate thought for the freedom of Ireland. If instead of Belgium and France, Ireland had been invaded, what help would Ireland have received from one or other of these countries? Neither interest nor gratitude nor yet kinship called for a single Irishman to fight in the war. No power could take, and no power has been able to take, a single Irish national to fight in France against his free will. But Irishmen thought that if Germany won, Belgium would become what they "mourned in Ireland, a nation in chains." The fight seemed to be one of justice against might, for the freedom of small nationalities. In such a fight, "Ireland," said Professor T. M. Kettle, who fell at Guinchy, "had a duty not only to herself but to the world . . . and whatever befell, the path taken must be the path of honor and justice." Concerning the number of Irishmen who took this vouched-for path of duty before America entered the war, Mr. John Redmond, M. P., wrote:

From Ireland, according to the latest official statistics, 173,772 Irishmen are serving in the navy and army. . . . Careful inquiries made through the churches in the North of England and in Scotland, and from other sources, show that, in addition, at least 150,000 sons of the Irish race, most of them born in Ireland, have joined the colors in Great Britain. It is a pathetic circumstance that these Irishmen in non-Irish regiments are forgotten except when their names appear in the casualty lists.

Adding to these the other young men of Ireland who, compelled by the economic conditions at home to seek elsewhere the means to exist, had emigrated to Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, and who had enlisted in their adopted countries, Mr. Redmond estimated that there were "more than half a million Irishmen with the colors" ("Ireland on the Somme," London, 1917, pp. 3-8). This number, 500,000, represents approximately one-tenth of the Irish-born in the world: and they fought as volunteers. They took the indicated path to justice and went to war as Irish "International Nationalists," believing that the greater freedom would include the less. Their number exceeded the volunteers of any other land: proportionately they represented an army of 11,000,000 Americans. They went to their graves in France and Gallipoli believing that the Irish issue in its international aspect was an integral part of the new international aspect of all national issues, the right to government only by the consent of the governed. The Irish from their unassailable position of racial detach-

ment and material disinterestedness were the only people in the world who could give the Allied cause moral vindication; and they gave it—without requiring England to consent immediately to withdraw from Ireland, without fulfilling the world duty of obtaining a guarantee that the war would be waged in good faith.

Graciously acknowledging the belligerent value of this international aspect of the Irish issue, Lord Kitchener, the British War Lord, wrote to the Dublin Viceregal Conference (1915): "Ireland's performance has been magnificent." "England is unworthy to kiss the hem of Ireland's garment," wrote the English litterateur, Chesterton, moved by the spectacle of a subject nation, voluntarily fighting for international freedom alongside its oppressor. "Whatever the future may have in store, the British people will never forget the generous blood of the sister nation which has been shed on so many hard-fought battlefields," said the London *Daily Telegraph*, March 18, 1916.

The war report of a subject nation in an imperial war, is published when to publish it is useful; and is altered or suppressed, when necessary, for the benefit of the Empire. The significance of the record may not have varied; but the accounting is in the hands of the imperial bookkeepers: there are no auditors: the report is published by those who compile it for their own ends. Hence, although England's gratitude to the sister nation of Ireland was still ringing in men's ears, although, too, the survivors of the 500,000 Irish were still fighting abroad for international freedom, from the day (Easter, 1916) when the Irish felt compelled to wrest from England a guarantee of good faith, to fight in Ireland, too, in the name of right against might, in the name of freedom of small nationalities, of the cause of international justice, the war report of the Irish was "Pigotted" in the press which England controlled throughout the world. And a grateful England shot as felons Pearse and his fellow-poets and seers, condoned the murder of Sheehy Skeffington and others, imprisoned Countess Markiewicz, Professors MacNeill and De Valera, and a thousand more, hanged and libeled Casement, placed an army of occupation in Ireland, put the country under martial law, thus giving full imperial recognition to the subject nation of Ireland before the silent but comprehending gaze of the suffering people of Belgium. Prior to the revolution of 1916 there had been lacking an international standard by which to test the solicitude of England for the freedom of small nationalities: a lack which the revolution supplied. Ireland measured England's avowed cause by that standard: and then unaided continued the fight for small nationalities on the Irish front: a front to which the recent armistice was not extended.

When America entered the war the Irish-born here felt that President Wilson had made holy again the Allied cause; had made the Irish issue once more an alienable part of the international aspect of all national issues. They felt that it was the duty of everyone in America to

fight for the freedom of all, for the freedom which America's President had pledged his word. Cobelligerent aliens who were called in the draft then possessed the right to claim exemption as aliens. The following percentages, computed from the Provost Marshal General's Report (Appendix 33, a) show the fashion in which this duty was accepted by the nationals of the several cobelligerent aliens. The percentages of the alien cobelligerents called who waived exemption and were accepted are as follows:

Ireland .....	30.4
Belgium .....	24.4
Scotland .....	24.2
England .....	22.5
Wales .....	22.0
Servia .....	21.7
Canada .....	21.0
France .....	19.4
Italy .....	16.8

Alexander of Russia sought and received no guarantees from England, and experienced the Congress of Vienna. Ireland sought and received no guarantees from England, and is now the only nation in the civilized world that is still being actively subjugated by an imperial Power. America sought and received no guarantees from England, and the consequences are yet unrevealed.

But certain dominant English statesmen now openly oppose the principles they formerly loudly professed or tacitly accepted and for which this war was fought. The British Coalition Government has issued an election address antagonistic to the Wilson principles of the new world-order. The *Populo Romano* (Dec. 4) publishes that Italy has joined England and France in an *entente*. The Allied Premiers have met, have secretly deliberated and publicly made announcement of their agreement. To at least this extent plain people are now forewarned. Analogous anticipatory secret deliberations, from which Russia was excluded, occurred at the end of the Russo-Turkish war in 1879, but it was only when the Peace Congress of Berlin was far advanced, and when by long preparatory maneuvering the way had been cleared for the announcement, that Europe was permitted to learn of the bargain made prior to the public Peace Congress, the bargain by which England in return for the long-coveted Island of Cyprus, guaranteed Turkey virtual integrity. Already tentative divisions of territory have been publicly and authoritatively suggested in the manner of the Congress of Vienna, in the manner of the Congress of Berlin. America has been party neither to these anticipatory deliberations nor to these munition-mongers' suggestions. Will America's President be alone at the Peace Congress

speaking for friends of humanity in every nation and of every program of liberty . . . for the silent mass of mankind everywhere who have as yet had no place or opportunity to speak their real hearts out concerning the death and ruin they see to have come upon the persons and homes they hold most dear.

He has gone to uphold the principles and policies for which he led Americans to spend their lives, their honor,



and their possessions. The seclusion of serried cordons of armed guard may surround the Conference; and its diplomacy may be shrouded by a censored press. But plain people everywhere will know how to judge the President's progress. There is one tested standard and only one by which the Allied cause may be judged, a standard by which every principle President Wilson has enunciated may be measured, a standard by which the present may be weighed with the past and the future may be estimated, the standard of Ireland. Covenants and the principles by which these are arrived at may or may not be open, and diplomacy may always remain frankly hidden from the public view. For, firstly, there can be no "absolute freedom of the seas outside of territorial waters, alike in peace and in war," without the freedom of Ireland: secondly, there can be no "removal, so far as is possible of all economic barriers," without the freedom of Ireland: thirdly, there can be no "adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with safety," without the freedom of Ireland: fourthly, there can be no "general association of nations formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity in great

and small States alike," without the freedom of Ireland: and lastly, there can be no moral application of "the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another whether they be strong or weak," without the freedom of Ireland. "Unless this principle be made its foundation no part of the structure of international justice can stand." Hence, by the standard of plain people, President Wilson must seek first the freedom of Ireland and all things else shall be added unto him.

Belgium a nation again is music to Irish ears. The free soil of France affords at least a grave worthy of the freemen of Ireland. The liberation of Poland gives gladness nowhere greater than in Ireland. Even from the waters of Babylon, Ireland welcomes the Jew to Zion. For Ireland, though fated to be the symbol and shield of empire, has faith in her freedom. She knows how to fight and pray, till the day of empires shall pass, till freedom shall come to the latest of nations, shall come even unto the last, when an Ireland free shall be given to the peoples as a sign that a message 2000 years old, the message of peace and good-will on earth, has been heard and heeded by men.

## The Economic Basis of American Prussianism

JOHN A. RYAN, D.D.

**T**HROUGHOUT the series of articles of which the present is the last, I have endeavored to draw a contrast between the democratic and the Prussian attitude toward the circumstances, conditions and aims of peace. Now the most striking and the most practical feature of these opposing political attitudes is the fact that they are the counterpart and in the large measure the effect of economic antagonisms. Political autocrats always believe in force as a determinant of rights and a solvent of disputes and problems. Industrial autocrats hold the same opinion and rely upon the same methods. When the political autocrat is confronted by opposition, he calls upon his army and navy. When the industrial autocrat faces a group of dissatisfied employees, he provokes or permits a strike, and waits for hunger, cold and sickness to enforce submission upon the refractory workers. The political autocrat puts his trust in military force; the industrial autocrat relies upon economic force. Generally both believe that their use of force is justified; for neither has faith in conferences, conciliation, arbitration, or the judgment of the people.

Once we have grasped, or renewed our grasp upon, this fundamental and pervasive kinship between political and economic autocracy, we readily understand the division in American opinion on the subject of peace, its circumstances and its consequences. The most persistent and most bitter critics of President Wilson, since he re-

plied to the first German request for an armistice, have been the champions and retainers of industrial autocracy and privileged plutocracy. Anyone who feels like questioning this statement should recall or reread the principal denunciations of the armistice discussions between October 8 and November 11. He will find that they came from certain metropolitan journals, from certain members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, from the officers of certain militaristic organizations and from certain prominent men who do not hold public office. If the inquirer examines the economic affiliations of these organs and persons, he will find that, with one or two notable exceptions, they all have long been recognized as the defenders of industrial autocracy and privilege. They distrusted and disliked the armistice discussions, first, because their methods and environment have made them believers in force, and nothing but force, and, second, because they feared that, if these exchanges of notes should lead to an immediate cessation of warfare, popular hatred of Germany would be softened, and the demand that she be commercially boycotted and kept out of the League of Nations would be considerably weakened.

The first article of this series contained the very easy forecast that the armistice, if established, would not silence the "bitter enders," that they would try to have their ideas incorporated in the peace terms and in the "subsequent military policy of the United States."

Exactly that is taking place. The exponents and servants of economic privilege grow louder and more insidious day by day in their opposition to those propositions in President Wilson's program which are not yet certain of adoption by the Peace Conference. They clamor for "special, selfish economic alliances" and commercial boycotts against Germany, because they have always believed in and, in so far as they could evade the law, have engaged in all sorts of special combinations and discriminatory practices in commerce and industry. The last thing that the industrial autocrat desires is competition on equal terms with his rivals. What he wants, and what his conception of his own superior status leads him to think that he has a right to get, is special economic privileges of many kinds, such as socially injurious protective tariffs, favors from railroads, secret and unjust contracts, and other financial and industrial devices that have been instrumental in the upbuilding of monopolies and trusts. It is, therefore, the most natural thing in the world that these men and their journalistic retainers should dislike the prospect of competing with German business concerns on equal terms in the markets of the world. They have never willingly competed on such a footing with their own countrymen.

However, the greater part of the plutocratic opposition is now directed against national disarmament, a league of nations, and the freedom of the seas. We are told that our long coast line, our possessions in the distant Pacific, and our rapidly growing merchant marine require the protection of an immense navy; that universal military training is essential in order that we may not again find ourselves in the condition of the "unpreparedness" which handicapped us when we entered the great war; and that a league of nations is merely a beautiful dream. Hostility, mostly indirect and unavowed, is shown toward the President's demand for "absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas," and sympathetic references are made to English criticisms. The fact that this demand is merely a brief restatement of the traditional American doctrine on the subject does not apparently disturb the super-patriots who are now obliquely questioning the wisdom of insisting upon this one of the "fourteen principles." They seem willing to accept the contention of some British statesmen that England should not be required to yield her naval supremacy to that of a league of nations. Apparently they welcome the impudent proposal that the safety of the world should henceforth be entrusted to the British navy, seconded at a respectful distance by that of the United States.

The greater part of the criticism of the President's trip to Europe is intimately related to the questions of disarmament, a League of Nations, and freedom of the seas. The critics are afraid that when the President sits in at the Peace Conference he may be able to compel the adoption of his views.

Why do the beneficiaries and retainers of economic autocracy and privilege dislike President Wilson's doc-

trine on these three points? It would seem that their own self-interest would make them desire, at least, the freedom and security of American maritime commerce during any war in which the United States occupied the position of a neutral. Undoubtedly they would favor this proposition if it stood alone. They oppose it simply because it is an argument for the project of a League of Nations, and is bound up with such a League.

Why are the champions of plutocracy opposed to a League of Nations? Probably for two reasons: first, because it would prevent the use of a powerful American army and navy to promote the unjust designs and claims of American capitalism in those backward and weaker lands which are to provide the most profitable fields for large investments in the coming years. The interested persons do not want their international projects and claims submitted to the impartial adjudication of an international court. Plutocracy's second reason for opposing a League of Nations is that it would mean disarmament and no universal military training in the United States. This motive is not improbably more influential than the first.

Some weeks ago Mr. Howard W. Gross told in the *New York Times* how 4,000 leading business men are co-operating in a remarkably efficient and far-reaching system of propaganda for universal and compulsory military training in the United States. His own interest in the movement began several years ago, after a conversation with the late railroad magnate James J. Hill. It was Mr. Hill's opinion that, unless the proper safeguards were adopted, the conflict of classes and industrial unrest would within twenty years produce in America a duplicate of the French Revolution. He thought that the most promising preventive was universal military training. The theory seems to be that, after a few years of such training, the masses would become docile, subservient, and submissive to industrial abuses and injustice. Moreover, they would probably acquire the mentality that revels in a militaristic patriotism; that is, a patriotism that thinks exclusively in terms of the sword and excessive nationalism, and which is always emotionally ready to resent real or fancied affronts by other nations. Gone would be the rational conception of patriotism, as not merely readiness to die for one's country, but an abiding desire to make it worth living in. If the minds of the masses can be turned away and kept away from their economic grievances and from aspirations for social justice, not only will the danger of revolution be averted, but the masters of industry will not be required to right even glaring economic wrongs. They can continue to pay insufficient wages to the worker, and exact extortionate prices from the consumer.

Just as the beneficiaries and retainers of economic privilege are the chief opponents of a League of Nations and disarmament, so the labor and progressive elements of our population are its most active supporters. However, the latter are in good company. They are co-



operating with the desires and proposals of Pope Benedict XV. As pointed out in the last two articles, the Pope has made a clear and positive declaration in favor of both disarmament and international arbitration, and his Secretary of State has said that the best means of effecting the disappearance of great standing armies is the abolition of compulsory military service. But the statements and aims of Pope Benedict and Cardinal Gaspari on these subjects have received very little support from Catholic leaders in America. Are we going to neglect them, as we neglected for many years the pronouncements of Pope Leo XIII on the social question?

To any reader of this article who thinks that "the economic interpretation" of the opposition to the peace program of Pope Benedict and President Wilson is artificial and far-fetched I would make this suggestion: See whether, among the opponents of this program, you can find five newspapers or five prominent men who have been conspicuous either for their services on behalf of social justice, or for their critical attitude toward the methods and designs of economic autocracy. When the skeptic has found that this search is vain, he will be ready to consider sympathetically these remarkably illuminating words, uttered about half a century ago by the great founder of the Catholic Social Reform movement in Germany, Bishop Ketteler: "If we wish to know our age we must endeavor to fathom the social question. The man who understands that knows his age. The man who does not understand it finds the present and the future an enigma."

## The Real Bar to Peace and Progress

MOORHOUSE MILLAR, S.J.

SOME weeks ago in an article of rather dubious praise on Archbishop Ireland the *Outlook* introduced its remarks with the following words:

Protestants find some difficulty in understanding how it is possible for a Roman Catholic to harmonize his faith in the infallibility of the Pope and his loyalty to the Church with unreserved loyalty to the nation of which he is a member. It must be said, on behalf of Protestants, that the difficulty of reconciling these two loyalties has proved great in Ireland and in France and almost insuperable in Italy; but it must be said, on the other hand, that American Roman Catholics have not found difficulty in reconciling their piety and their patriotism in this country. (October 9, 1918, p. 209.)

With regard to the first part of this statement, we think that the Protestant difficulty about the reconciliation of belief in Papal infallibility with patriotism may be waved aside as too manifestly foolish for consideration, seeing that Newman in his well-known answer to Gladstone, and many others since, have given fullest satisfaction on this point to all who have not refused to read the works of Catholic writers or who have not had reasons of their own, professional or otherwise, for shutting their eyes to every inconvenient point in a Catholic argument. What, on the other hand, is par-

ticularly worthy of note in the passage, is not so much what the writer says as what he does not say; and perhaps the best comment on his words will be found in the concluding sentence to this paragraph taken from Edmund Burke's very illuminative letter on the "Roman Catholics of Ireland." Writing ostensibly to Sir Hercules Langrishe, M. P., in 1792, Burke said:

As little shall I detain you with matters that can as little obtain admission into a mind like yours, such as the fear, or pretense of fear, that in spite of your own power and the trifling power of Great Britain you may be conquered by the Pope; or that this commodious bugbear (who is of infinitely more use to those who pretend to fear than to those who love him) will absolve his Majesty's subjects from their allegiance, and send over the Cardinal of York to rule you as his Viceroy; or that by the plenitude of his power he will take that fierce tyrant, the King of the French (Louis XVI), out of his jail and arm that nation—which on all occasions treats his Holiness so politely—with his Bulls and pardons, to invade poor old Ireland, to reduce you to Popery and slavery and to force the free-born, naked feet of your people into the wooden shoes of that arbitrary monarch. I do not believe that discourses of this kind are held by any who walk about without a keeper. Yet, I confess, that on occasions of this nature I am the most afraid of the weakest reasonings, because they discover the strongest passions. These things will never be brought out in definite propositions . . . but I know, and am sure, that such ideas that no man will distinctly produce to another or hardly venture to bring in any plain shape to his own mind—he will utter in obscure, ill-explained doubts, jealousies, surmises, fears and apprehensions; and that in such a fog they will appear to have a good deal of size, and will make an impression; when, if they were clearly brought forth and defined, they would meet with nothing but scorn and derision.

If the words of the writer for the *Outlook* are to be made to mean anything, we must in our interpretation of them allow for that common Protestant assumption, evidently at the back of his mind, that Luther and the Reformation brought freedom into the world, and that flowing from such a source freedom should normally be found incompatible with Catholic belief; that since American liberty is, as the onditologists would still have it, a late product of the Reformation movement, and of the same brand with those liberties so loudly advertised on the European Continent by anti-Catholic Liberals throughout the nineteenth century, it should be an object for sincere and agreeable surprise that the American Catholic can be loyal to the nation of which he is a member. As the *Outlook*, however, aims at appealing to the more intellectual element in the country and as recent events and the results of modern historical research stand out, even in the works of non-Catholic historians, as more and more definitely contradictory of his assumptions, the writer of the passage in question was not in a position to "distinctly produce" such ideas. That he wrote as he did is a sorry commentary on his own knowledge and the credulity of his readers.

We turn now to those who have "clearly brought forth" what the *Outlook* did not dare to say. According to the papers, at the jubilee mass-meeting of the United Lutheran Church in America, held recently in

the Hippodrome, New York, the principles of ecclesiastical freedom as expounded by Martin Luther, and deliverance from religious autocracy (*sic*) formed the theme of the addresses delivered by numerous speakers on the occasion of the merger of the many bodies into which the Lutheran Church in the United States and in Canada had hitherto been separated. The spirit behind the merger was very fittingly expressed, no doubt in the declaration of the Rev. M. M. Kinard, that "The people are tired of hearing it said there are twenty-four denominations of Lutherans." To an outsider, to be sure, such a substitution of the popular breath for the Holy Ghost as a principle of union, is somewhat surprising and savors rather forcibly of the least reasonable and most Socialistic and revolutionary ideas set forth by Rousseau in support of his genuinely Protestant notion of a *Contrat Social*. What the doctrinal basis may have been for such a merger we do not know. But certainly Professor Harnack of Germany, who knew Lutheranism and what it promises, as well as any of those present at the Hippodrome, should not be left uninformed. For writing several years before the war he said:

The people of Western Europe are still either Catholic or Protestant. *Tertium adhuc non datur*. It is Luther who created for them this alternative. And it is an alternative which concerns us more than all the scientific and philosophical culture of the present time, or all its technical applications. The people are, however, on the lookout for a *tertium genus ecclesiae*, under which they may find shelter for their higher life.

At such a juncture as that which obtains at the present time, it might be well for many if they would reflect on these words and then recall Burke's simple statement of fact: "A man is certainly the most perfect Protestant who protests against the whole Christian religion."

Of more immediate import to us, however, are the words to which the Rev. John A. W. Haas gave utterance in an address on "The Message of Lutheranism for the New Age." He was at great pains to note that back of November 11, 1918, the day that marks the epoch of the political deliverance of millions of men, lay November 10, 1517, the birthday of Martin Luther; but failed to call to mind that the day on which Germany—the land where Luther made his deepest and most genuine impression—was, at the eleventh hour and on the eleventh day of the eleventh month, readmitted on probation to the society of civilized nations, happened to be the feast day of St. Martin of Tours, the great apostle of Gaul, the eldest daughter of the Church. But then, as the Rev. J. A. W. Haas continued, "Germany failed in 1848 to give its people just political freedom, it sowed the weed of autocracy which finally destroyed it, and now it must come to freedom, because freedom is a moral fact and a reality which cannot be destroyed." How he could have forgotten the earlier date, 1648, when at the Peace of Westphalia, the Lutheran principle "*Cujus Regio Ejus Religio*" went into full effect, and absolutism, for the first time in the history of the Christian era,

became firmly seated in the saddle, we leave it for others to decide. Perhaps Madame de Stael, herself a Protestant, furnishes the clue which also would, without doubt, explain that peculiar "psychological twist" which former Ambassador Gerard found so mystifying in the German character. Writing of Protestantism, she says:

It was among the Germans that a revolution effected through the medium of ideas was destined to take place, for the dominant characteristic of this meditative people is the energy of its internal conviction. Once an opinion takes possession of the German mind, their patience and perseverance in sustaining it do singular honor to the power of the human will.

Some such method of accounting for the all too frequent Protestant lapses in history will be fairly borne out if we turn to the real Lutheran meaning back of the assertion of the Rev. J. A. W. Haas, that "freedom is a moral fact and a reality which cannot be destroyed." This meaning can be no better illustrated than by the following exposition of its true historical genesis, taken from the pages of Imbart de la Tour, one of the great living French historians:

Let us make sure [he writes] that there were no greater intellectual revolutions even before the Reformation. In destroying the correct idea of law, the criticism of Occam thrust aside the whole synthetic and realistic achievement of the scholastic thinkers. On the one hand it divorced philosophy from theology, severed, and even set up in mutual denial, the two spheres of thought—where in the one, reason penetrates into the world of phenomena and in the other is raised by faith to the supernatural—and thus proclaims the existence of two so-called "truths" which at times could be irreconcilable and even, it might be, contradictory. On the other hand, once reason was dethroned, the world no longer appeared except as a system of unrelated individual activities. The will became the one predominant faculty, and, not being able to conceive of itself otherwise than as endowed with absolute autonomy, the entire sacredness of our being was concentrated in the one sovereign power of self-determination and free choice or liberty. And such being the nature of Occam's doctrine, there is very little difficulty in discovering the influence of his theory of knowledge and the world on the original thought of the Reformer (Luther). ("*Les Origines de la Réforme*." Vol. III, p. 14.)

So much then for the historical lapses. If we turn now to some of the further bearings of the above passage, it may be noted that we have here the real origin and essence of genuine Protestantism together with a full explanation of what alone is meant when it is said that the Lutheran doctrine of private judgment brought freedom into the world. But with its true nature thus revealed, we defy the Rev. J. A. W. Haas, or any one else, to find anything in such a doctrine that will tend to support or give effect to his other very acceptable but utterly non-Lutheran statements that "democracy will fail unless it is founded on eternal principle." "We must not at this time be subjected to all sorts of uprisings that will destroy peace, law and order and justice." "Popular government does not mean the right of any people to destroy law, order and institutions." In proof, moreover, of this our contention, we need only appeal to the English philosopher, Sir W. Hamilton, who, though unwittingly, has very honestly stated the cold clear truth



how this much vaunted doctrine of private judgment really stands practically related to "those eternal principles" which, once we are well rid of the Lutheran autocracy of a Germany Emperor, can alone form the basis of that democracy which will save us from mob rule and Rousseau's Socialistic State.

It is not knowledge [he tells us] it is not truth, that he (the votary of science) principally seeks; he seeks the exercise of his faculties and feelings; and in following after the one (unestablished fact) he exerts a greater amount of pleasurable energy than in taking formal possession of the thousand (that have been established), he disdains the certainty of the many and prefers the chances of the one.

And as he goes on to add:

The last worst calamity that could befall man, as (according to the Protestant conception) he is at present constituted, would be that full and final possession of speculative truth, which he

now vainly anticipates as the consummation of his intellectual happiness.

This, furthermore, as goes almost without saying, is also pretty much Kant's notion of things; and Emanuel Kant, it should never be forgotten, a Protestant of the Protestants, plainly confessed "I found it necessary to deny knowledge of God, freedom and immortality in order to find a place for (Lutheran) faith."

Evidently Kant was not the only person who had to deny primal truths on which morality rests, in order to find a place for (Lutheran) faith. There are others like him, Count Hohenzollern for instance, the greatest enemy of human freedom, a man who blessed God in Germany and rejoiced over sacrileges done by his soldiers in Belgium and France. Truly, Luther was the father of modern democracy. Who can doubt it?

## Berlin a Generation Ago

AUSTIN O'MALLEY, M. D.

**T**ODAY in looking over an article on Berlin I wrote in 1895 I found this statement:

Perhaps the most remarkable trait in the Berlines and Prussian character is an amazing national arrogance. The motto *Gott mit Uns* is not a motto, but the verbal expression of a monopoly. This childishness seems to be universal, even in the universities. The success of 1870 has turned their heads.

These superior airs were not in evidence in Bavaria, Saxony or Austria, and Americans got along pleasantly in these States, but in Prussia we were always knocking against hard skulls. I often heard American medical students say in those days, "If Germany ever gets into war I'm coming over to volunteer on the other side just to even up a few facts." When I went to Berlin first in 1891 the Prussian spirit shown in the recent war, which Americans looked upon as a late change, was fully evident.

There were 1,500,000 inhabitants in the city then. It was a modern town, much more modern in every part than the old sections of Philadelphia are now; a gray town, with many painted façades. The houses went up four stories and stopped there, all regular like Prussian infantry; and if you fell from a window in the city between daylight and dark you would alight upon the helmet spike of some member of that Prussian infantry, unless you hit upon a policeman. All the males of the city that were not soldiers, government officials, or students, appeared to be policemen. The name Berlin suggests policemen and passports, as Liverpool is a synonym for soft-coal smoke.

The city police were efficient because the citizens were well disciplined in the police regulations. When a native was arrested he was told to go to the station house and report to the desk sergeant, to be his own patrol wagon. This method saved the police much pedestrianism, as no one ever even dreamed of disobedience. Once I saw a young fellow actually break away and run from an

astounded policeman, but the culprit was a foreigner. The policeman in a heavy overcoat, clumsy rubber boots, and an aggrieved countenance, followed afar off plethorically until his oxygen gave out. That subversion of the usual probably ended in the policeman's eternal disgrace. The Prussian delights in the accustomed. He is not original. He never invents. He takes the discoveries of foreigners and develops them. There is not a principle in modern commerce, warfare, or science which is solely his, not even the Diesel gas engine. His generals were imitating Napoleon while Foch was bettering Napoleon.

The city is far enough north to make the winter days very short, and when it is not snowing there is a miserable Scotch mist drizzling, drizzling. In summer the weather is never hot. The streets are constantly wetted by lines of men and boys, scraped with rubber-edged boards, then at once sprinkled with sand and made all dirty again; but labor is cheap. The street cars had so many seats and so many standing places, and when these were taken the conductor would not let anyone on until someone had left. It was customary to give the conductor a penny tip when he collected the fare. There were no newsboys in the city, no bootblacks—the servant girl blackened the shoes, or you did the job yourself—no cats, no errand dogs, no tramps. Every door had a metal sign telling that the indwellers were members of the society for the suppression of beggars, tramps, and all that ilk. The only use the Berliner has for dogs is in pulling carts, and the load a big German dog can pull is astonishing. At ten o'clock p. m. piano-playing ceased or the police would find out the cause of the hilarity. The corner loafer, and the street hoodlum were unknown. Even loud whistling at night was *verboten*. Our trolley-car whistlers, and the canaries that whistle the beads at Low Mass would all be in jail as is meet and just. At every corner were old men,

wearing red caps, who would go anywhere on errands for a few pennies. Telegraph wires were laid along the roofs of the houses, not in the streets. There were no posters plastered all over the town and roadside as with us. At the street corners were cylinders with posters on them, such as theater announcements, and a handy map of the neighborhood. Newspaper "extras" were little six-by-six dodgers, containing a single caption, and men went about calling out the entire content of the extra, whereupon the Berliners bought them excitedly and readjusted what the criers had already told them.

There were no fires in the city of any importance because there were no fireplaces in the houses which could start a blaze. The firemen wore ancient Roman helmets and carried saw-edged swords. They rode to the fire in busses, and drew up before the afflicted house in company front. An officer went into the house with dignity and no haste and investigated the fire. He came out and reported to the commandant, who wrote a full report in his note book. When the report had been finished a man was ordered in with a bucket or a Babcock extinguisher to annihilate the fire. The fire company still stood in the street in company front at attention until the bucket returned. Then there was more writing in the notebook and the meeting adjourned. A Berlin fire company in action was the most entertaining sight in Europe.

The stove in a Berlin room was made of white glazed tiles. It towered up to near the ceiling, and was shaped exactly like a tombstone in a Masonic cemetery, and, as Mark Twain said, kept one meditating on death when he should be enjoying his travels. I have no doubt these domiciliary tombstones are an important factor in the high German suicide-rate. They certainly are cheerful objects to look at when one's pocketbook is low and he is feeling melancholy. In the morning the slavey would put a half-dozen compressed bricks of fuel in the tombstone and light them. They would slightly warm the door of the *memento mori* and give up the ghost. We kept warm by using double windows, which were nailed up in the autumn and taken down in spring. The house was thus sewn into its clothes as the Jewish immigrant children are sewn in here in the fall, and the air in the rooms could be used to hang coats on, or as a couch. There were no bathtubs in the houses, but the lack of an object unknown causes no regret. There were two or three public bathhouses in the city used by eccentric foreigners from America. The Berliner was bathed at birth and sometimes before the funeral as elsewhere on the European continent, and as was customary in America about fifty years ago. For that matter the same custom holds for the greater part of the United States today.

German women universally are possessed by the demon of scrubbing and house cleaning. They delight in dusting and hiding a man's papers as our women do, but no American woman has the scrubbing diathesis in so acute

a degree as this disease prevails in Germany. When they are not scrubbing they are knitting, or eating. They take four meals a day at least. They do not "shop" as our women do because German merchants will not tolerate that dissipation. If a man is with a lady and he buys something for himself in a shop the package is handed to the lady to carry.

Amiel and countless others have commented on the stiff *Vornehmlichkeit* of the Germans, their lack of distinction in manner, ease, charm, wit. These writers say they are ill-mannered. This statement is positively not true of the Viennese; I have met as charming gentlemen in Vienna as one could find anywhere. If there are any like the Viennese men in Berlin it was not my good fortune to find them, with the exception of Professor Olshausen, of the University. In Italy one cannot avoid meeting gentlemen, in Berlin it requires no effort at all to escape them. The Berlineses will even admit quite frankly they are not gentlemen, but plain blunt men with no frills.

Mark Twain in "A Tramp Abroad" gives a highly colored description of the German university student and his knowledge, which is utterly erroneous. The German student is quiet in the lecture room; there is none of the "horse-play" that prevails in American universities. He has always finished a full college course before he enters the university and so differs from the American student, who is only an undergraduate or a man doing university work without the preliminary training. If a boy goes through an American college before entering the university he knows as much as the German student does. Mark Twain said the German Fox speaks Latin fluently. He does not. I have often tried to find one in the university when I went there first who would give me information in Latin because my German had an impediment in its speech, and I never found one that could talk Latin at all. The fault was not mine, because I had been in Italy for some years before I went to Germany and I had no difficulty in making the Italians understand me. I never saw an Italian university student that could not speak Latin with delightful fluency, but German university Latin is a myth, at least in Berlin.

In place of our football battles, track meets and Greek-letter fraternity meetings, the Berlineses and other German university students have the duel, the *Kneipe*, and occasionally a *Fest-Kommers*. The *Kneipe* is an exercise in which a party of students, about once a week, chat, sing and drink beer after a somewhat elaborate ceremonial. The duelling corps have gaudy uniforms. Tiny, embroidered tasseled caps set aslant rakishly on hair well oiled and parted mathematically down the back of the scalp, braided velveteen jackets, gorgeous silken sashes, white breeches which fit like bottle labels, jack-boots bespurred ferociously, and basket-hilted sabres are worn. The faces are all seamed with hideous scars. These scars are signs of a university education in Ger-



many. Two or three students are killed annually in these duels, and hundreds are disfigured for life. About 1890 an effort was made to have this duelling stopped, but the Kaiser interfered. He said: "Let the boys fight; it makes them manly." When a university has a clever swordsman he is sent about from university to university to fight, as we send out football teams. There was a Cuban swordsman in the University of Berlin in my time there who spoke English with a decided cockney accent, and used to invite us to go to see him "carve a Prussian." He carved one a week for a long time and he never once was even touched. I do not know whether there was any change in the duelling custom after my time, but twenty-five years ago the condition was savage enough, and it explains much of what happened in the late war. They did not fight because of some real or fancied insult, but just as our boys get up a friendly boxing match, and they chopped one another like bulldogs. If a wound threatened to heal by first intention and leave no scar they rubbed it open so that it would leave a mark. This was university *Kultur*. American students were not insulted because they had a crude method of punching the jaw of a Prussian gentleman, or if the worst came they insisted upon using heavy American revolvers and revolvers are dangerous.

At a *Fest-Kommers* in honor of Virchow's jubilee in 1891 there were nearly 5,000 students present. This meeting was in the great hall of a Berlin brewery, which was decorated with evergreens and hundreds of flags and banners. The galleries were thronged with ladies, faintly smiling through mists of tobacco smoke from German cigars. The worst cigars in the world are made in Italy, in the opinion of some judges, but there are men that insist the German cigars have them beaten. At long pine tables below the smoke the multitude of students were busy in the early part of the evening buying beer checks from the waiters. A single check represented the value of a pint of beer, and it saved trouble in making change later in the evening when the light grew blurred. Each student bought ten checks.

As a student approached a table on entering the hall he bowed after the German fashion; that is, he clicked his heels together, broke into two parts at the waist suddenly like a shutting carpenter's rule, and recovered. He then announced his name. The men nearby muttered their own names in return, and the deep murmur of the conversation was renewed. When a professor entered the trumpeters sounded an alarm, the duelling corps smote the tables with the flat of their sabres magnificently, and the multitude arose. The professor broke in two at the waist and all sat down.

At intervals between the songs and speeches they would drink a salamander in honor of the Kaiser, Virchow, or something else. The sabres clashed, someone shouted "*Eins! Zwei! Drei!*" as the multitude arose. Five thousand pints of beer were lifted and tasted; then down on the tables with a thundrous crash came all

the glasses. Three times around in splashing circles the sea of beer was pushed; then up it surged, and 5,000 pints of the foaming liquid was poured into the flower of the Fatherland in one stupendous gurgle. At the resumption of respiration they shouted "*Hoch!*" Then they chanted "*Heil, Kaiser, Dir!*" or some other ditty.

## The K. of C. and Reconstruction

JOHN B. KENNEDY

THE old song of preparedness has been sung so often during the many months in which the world rocked with war and reverberated with the echoes of the guns that we are familiar and even bored with its refrain. We can spare ourselves a large measure of mental fatigue if we merely remark that the war found us unprepared, and the happy and quite palpable promise that peace shall not find us so. As a matter of fact, American Catholics can pay to themselves the solid and perhaps singular compliment that they were quite prepared to play their full part in the war when it came, and that they are now equally well prepared to play their full part in the peace with which Heaven has blessed us. If we seek for a synonym for our preparedness I think every fair-minded observer will find it in the words, Knights of Columbus.

At the moment of our entry into the great war the Knights of Columbus had a definite program and efficient machinery with which to carry out that program. This they promptly placed at the disposal of the proper authorities, and before many of us who pride ourselves on being able to point out where and how Catholics may render public service were able to indite literary epistles to the Catholic press, the Knights had stepped into the breach between Catholic inactivity and Catholic opportunity, and American Catholicism was brought prominently before the nation as an accredited agency for war-work. Some there are, and the suspicion is well founded that they are the least qualified, who have said that the Knights have been late in this and late in that. Their ignorance of prevailing circumstances is balanced by a lack of general insight. What would they have said if the Knights had pursued a strictly fraternal path and done nothing in the way of war-work? Then Catholic effort, other than the splendid Catholic contribution of men and treasure, would most assuredly have been too late to mend.

Let us all be bold enough to look the facts in the face and admit that the Knights, backed by full Catholic support, saved American Catholicism from a deplorable hiatus in its war-effort. Their entire resources and machinery were thrown into the gap, and it has worked so wonderfully well that the Catholic Church in America has had the ancient theory put into practice, that with intense organization and skilful direction the Catholics of America can match endeavors and results with the great non-Catholic and secular organizations.

Just as they won prestige for the Catholic name in this great war, so the Knights of Columbus are well prepared to maintain that prestige with the advent of peace. If American Catholicism had no large and principally lay organization at this juncture of events, every philosopher and prophet among us would be proclaiming the need of some society, would be describing the nature and the constitution and ramifications of this needed society; and this description would be found to tally exactly with an abstract statement of the corporate fact known as the Knights of Columbus.

What would not our brave Bishops of the reconstruction period following the Civil War have given for an organization of 500,000 men banded together because they cherish identical Catholic and patriotic ideals and because they have one ambition, to make those ideals issue in religious and social results, and, what is of most practical importance, because they have the

energy, the resources and the public confidence to go forward and do great things?

Through their nearly 500,000 members, a number destined, I believe, to be doubled when the boys are all eventually home, through their 1,900 Councils and their perfected State and national organizations, the Knights of Columbus with public goodwill as their largest secular asset, can render unprecedented service to the country in the name of the Church. Confronted with problems of employment for the returned masses and for those other masses heretofore engaged in war-work; with the problem of education more intensive and discriminatory than ever before; with the problem of social welfare and the vastly important problem of the Americanization of those hundreds and thousands of our foreign-born inhabitants, a large percentage of them Catholic, the nation looks to those existing agencies whose actual work in the camps and at the front has earned its moral and financial support to aid in the solution of the pressing problems at home. The country will be disappointed and perhaps chagrined if these agencies fail now that they are put to the more serious test of peace.

Our non-Catholic fellow-citizens, through their diverse religious and social organizations, are working with an energy that might be described as feverish, in their attempts to be in the vanguard of all reconstruction work. Their ambitions overleap national boundaries; and this is, perhaps, where they are incautious, for educational work in Greece and other foreign countries can never have the same appeal to the American who is called upon to finance such work as reconstruction effort in his own land, where such effort is all too sorely needed.

There is no reason why every Knights of Columbus Council throughout the country should not now become a permanent haven for men being mustered out of the service as well as for those still in it. No other Catholic organization is better equipped than the Knights to conduct a nation-wide chain of employment bureaus, their secretaries in the camps and overseas registering the boys who desire jobs and dovetailing this registry with a registry maintained by the home Councils, of jobs available for returned men. The plan has all that simplicity and demand for immense and sustained industry that are required to render it great as a source of public service. As far as social service is concerned, wherever the Knights have built a social center it is a tangible factor in the betterment of local society. But effort along this line is barely beyond the pioneer stage. It can be developed to a high degree of usefulness and influence. By their Catholic University endowment, their patronage of "The Catholic Encyclopedia" and their fruitful campaigns against Socialism, the Knights are well experienced in the value and process of educational endeavor. So too with education and Americanization. No groups of men engaged in the winning of the war have worked harder than the Knights of Columbus secretaries. Their pay has been moderate, their labor incessant; but they have succeeded in making an indelible impression of Catholic zeal and patriotic devotion on the young manhood of the country.

The entire subject is so great and so vital that to anybody who sees the vista of possibility ahead there comes the one dominant urge—the Knights must "carry on" and do even greater things than they have already done. The American public knows them and will support them. They have been weighed in the balance of war and found faithful and effective. They must not and will not be found wanting in the test that comes with peace.

### COMMUNICATIONS

*Letters, as a rule, should not exceed six-hundred words.*

#### France and Catholicism

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In spite of their surprising tone of finality, the remarks published in AMERICA of November 23 on the above subject call for an answer. Reverend Father Stettner's observations during his

four years in France have manifestly failed to reveal to him the real condition of Catholicism in that country. Race-suicide is not universal in France: in Brittany, in Lorraine, in the central provinces, in Savoie, in the Southwest, large families are still common. Nor is race-suicide confined to France: it is a modern universal evil. The conditions which have caused it in France are rapidly having the same result in other countries, and if they are not remedied, France will soon lose that unenviable leadership.

There are in France atheistic newspapers; but how can the Catholic press be considered insignificant, even if compared to the Masonic press, when presenting papers like *La Croix*, *L'Eclair*, *La Libre Parole*, magazines like *Le Correspondent*, published in Paris, and a large number of Catholic papers all over the country? And what about the great leading secular newspapers which are neither subservient to Masonic politics nor antagonistic to Catholicism? I hope Father Stettner is not ignorant of the splendid religious revival which has taken place in French literature in the last forty years. Authors of first rank like Brunetière, Ollé-Laprune, Bourget, Coppée, Henry Bordeaux, René Bazin, Reynès-Monlaur, Maurice Barrès, leaders in religious thought, are popular in France and abroad. Is it in France only that the public-school system is atheistic? Is not Father Stettner familiar with the incomparable school system maintained by French Catholics to counteract it? I doubt that it will ever be duplicated in any country. Besides parochial schools and Catholic colleges, the great Catholic universities of Paris, Lille, Angers, Toulouse, are a noble evidence of the vitality of Catholicism in the higher classes.

The French Government has persecuted the Church! It should be distinctly understood that the French Government does in no way represent the religious mentality of the French people. The majority of voters which has placed such a Government in control, compared to the total number of citizens, is a small minority. Everywhere a minority of unscrupulous politicians can always snatch the power from the hands of a majority of honest citizens. Are not the Bolsheviks a minority in unfortunate Russia? The Church in France has been persecuted! But how did the French Catholics withstand the persecution? Were the 40,000 priests of France, deprived of their income, of untold millions of property, unworthy of their trust? Is there in the whole of Christendom a clergy more enlightened, more united in spirit, more docile to the voice of the Supreme Shepherd than the French clergy? And how magnificently the French Catholics rallied around their leaders!

Religious persecution in France has been a failure. The separation of Church and State has accumulated material ruins; but by breaking the governmental shackles of the Napoleonic Concordat it has (how unintentionally!) given the Church a greater freedom. Catholicism has progressed in the throes of persecution. All over France, the old churches have been maintained and many new ones erected. In the Diocese of Paris alone, more than forty parishes, with new churches and schools, have been established in the last fifteen years. Religious communities still in large number are helping the Catholic clergy in the work of reconstruction, and France, as ever, leads in mission work in foreign countries. "By their fruits you shall know them." The French Catholics can indeed triumphantly accept the challenge. A terrible fight was forced upon them; gallantly they accepted it and they have won.

New Orleans.

FRANÇOIS RACINE.

#### Charity and Parcel Post

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Christmas is approaching and it is certain that we shall all make a large use of the parcel post for the distribution or exchange of good cheer of the material order. There is another use to which the parcel post could be put at Christmas time, and I venture to suggest it to your good readers, not as something



original, but because I have already discovered so many to whom the idea had not occurred, and who, upon mention of it, began a lively activity, by this medium, in behalf of Christ's poor. The idea, in a word, is to make the parcel post our Santa Claus to the deserving poor, at Christmas time. Old Santa slips down the chimney unobserved at night, and remains not for a "thank you" for his gifts: so could the parcel post in broad daylight, deliver his box of sweets, or other welcome gift at the doors of the poor and no one would be the wiser that it was a message of charity, or who it was that sent it. The sender would have the consolation at Christmas, of knowing that he had delivered a real right-handed gift at a deserving door, so camouflaged by parcel post, that neither his left hand knew of it, nor, what is more to the point, did the neighbors know that the delivery was a charity to God's poor. The poor, if they are deserving poor, are sensitive of their condition, and would rather suffer the inconvenience of their needs than the public stigma of being recipients of charity. Parcel post removes the danger of this embarrassment, as the postman knocks at every door at Christmas-time, and his calling at the door of the poor will attract no special notice.

The question remains, to whom shall we send our parcels this Christmas, if we are determined to give this system of almsgiving a trial. Well, if we know of some family, the younger members of which attend our church or Sunday-school, without even a necktie or a hair ribbon as the case may be, or much more in need of a pair of shoes, or a warm coat or a hat or gloves, some day when we are downtown, we could get a department store to ship through the mails the parcel, which is to make these children the equal in comfort of their more opulent neighbors or companions. Failing in this requisite power of observation, we could ask the parish secretary of the St. Vincent de Paul Society for a name or two, or, could even hail some dear devoted parish priest, who knows and loves everyone of Christ's poor, knows their every need from coal-bin to pantry, or from overcoat to the ever-failing galluses and shoestrings. Even the little things will count, and the postman will be glad to leave his tiny parcel at the door, and the bigger and heavier the parcel, the gladder he will be to drop it there. Send six pairs of warm stockings and a red and a blue hair ribbon to little Ethel Brown and you will cheat the poor widow Brown of her principal worry for a year, while on the contrary, if you have some orphanage in view don't mind this fine discrimination; you can send that way the first bit of food or clothes you meet, and the Sisters will find an objective for it, if they have to resort to that unlikely expedient of hunting up a new orphan to fit the gift.

Parcel post may be a nightmare to some expressmen, but it is certainly a good camouflage for an act of charity. I know many little boys who through this medium received candy, caps, shoes and gloves last Christmas, and I saw with my own eyes, many a poor little girl who smiled happily beneath a huge splash of hair ribbon which she said Santa had brought her, when I knew he hadn't. Last year's coats need not go into camphor for an age, while so handy a Vincent de Paul clerk as parcel post is at hand, to drop it at the door behind which, one little child, at least, is imprisoned for the winter, because just this article of need is lacking. "Don't cry, Johnny, I am sorry you haven't a coat to go out with the boys. But thank God for this warm room and enough to eat. There's many a poor family cold and hungry this Christmas day. Please God you'll have your overcoat ere long too."

Woodstock, Md.

J. B. M.

#### The First American-Born Nun

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Among the interesting contributions to the second number of the new *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* is a letter from Mother St. Charles, of the New Orleans Ursuline Convent, in

which the claim is made that Mary Turpin, the daughter of Louis Turpin, keeper of the King's Warehouse in Illinois, and his Indian wife, was "the first American-born nun." Mary Turpin entered the Ursuline novitiate at New Orleans, La., July 2, 1749, and on December 7 of the same year became the lay-Sister St. Martha of that community.

Mother St. Charles will probably find some objections filed to her laudable desire to put New Orleans at the head of the list. One, for instance, might come from the Quebec Convent of the Ursulines, which is the oldest institution for the education of women in North America. It dates from August 1, 1639. The records there tell of an American nun born about 1683.

She was Mary Anne Davis, whose parents were killed in an Indian raid on Oyster River, New Hampshire, on July 18, 1694. The Abnaki Indians carried her off as a captive and some time after Father Rasle, S.J., rescued her and took her to Canada, where, in 1698, she entered the Ursuline convent at Quebec and was professed as Sister St. Benedict.

She died before Sister St. Martha had entered the New Orleans convent. A transcript of the record of her death in the convent diary was printed as follows in the *Sacred Heart Review* of October 24, 1908:

The Lord has just taken from us our dear Mother Mary Anne Davis de St. Benoît, after five months' illness, during which she manifested great patience. She was of English origin and carried away by a band of savages, who killed her father before her eyes. Fortunately she fell into the hands of the chief of a village who was a good Christian, and did not allow her to be treated as a slave, according to the usual practices of the savages towards their captives. She was about fifteen years old when redeemed by the French, and lived in several good families successively, in order to acquire the habits of civilized life and the use of the French language. She everywhere manifested excellent traits of character, and appreciated so fully the gift of faith that she would never listen to any proposal of returning to her own country, and constantly refused the solicitations of the English commissioners, who at different times came to treat for the exchange of prisoners. Her desire to enter our boarding school in order to be more fully instructed in our holy religion was granted, and she soon formed the resolution to consecrate herself wholly to Him who had so mercifully led her out of the darkness of heresy. Several charitable persons aided in paying the expenses of her entrance, but the greater part of her dowry was given by the Community (i. e., by the Ursulines themselves) in view of her decided vocation and the sacrifice she made of her country in order to preserve her Faith.

Her monastic obligations she perfectly fulfilled, and she acquitted herself with exactness of the employment assigned her by holy obedience. Her zeal for the decoration of the altar made her particularly partial to the office of sacristan. Her love of industry, her ability, her spirit of order and economy, rendered her still very useful to the Community, though she was at least seventy years of age.

She had great devotion to the Blessed Virgin and daily said the rosary. Her confidence in St. Joseph made her desire his special protection at the hour of death—a desire that was granted, for she died on the second of March of this year 1749, after receiving the Sacraments with great fervor, in the fiftieth year of her religious life.

Another American nun in this Quebec convent, and also an Abnaki captive, was Esther Wheelwright, who was elected Superior of the community in 1760. In our neglect of American Catholic history the stories of the many Indian captives who were taken to Canada and of their descendants are not generally known. The famous Archbishop Plessis of Quebec was the grandson of Martha French, one of the captives made in the raid on Deerfield, Mass., February 28, 1704. In Canada, she became a convert and married Jean Luis Menard, and their daughter, Louise, was the mother of Joseph Amable Plessis, first Archbishop of Quebec. The burning of Deerfield was one of the great events of the French and Indian wars on the colonies, and the subsequent history of the captives taken to Canada makes a very interesting chapter in Catholic American annals.

Brooklyn.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

# AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1918

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.  
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;  
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN

## SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00  
Canada, \$3.50 ; Europe, \$4.00

## Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

*AMERICA will have a special correspondent at the Peace Conference, in the person of Mr. J. C. Walsh, late editor of the "Montreal Star."*

## A List of Names

A COMMITTEE of the United States Senate is just now investigating people and things, before and after the war. In connection with this, the newspapers published a few days since a series of names said to have been compiled by one Dr. Fuehr, a German, for propaganda purposes. According to the report the paper on which the names were written, was labeled, "Important List of Names." The men listed were in many cases distinguished American citizens who have deserved well of their country. Thus, one is an officer of high rank in our army, others are well-known professors who gave their services to this Government to hasten victory as best they might.

One name in the aforesaid series may be of special interest to the readers of AMERICA. It was written variously "Thirney" (*sic*) and "Thierney" (*sic*) of the "American Catholic Weekly" (*sic*). Evidently this is meant to stand for the name of the Editor of AMERICA. The case then is this: long before our entrance into the war, without the consent or knowledge of the person concerned, a German, resident in this country, put the name of an editor of a national review on his list, in the hope, no doubt, of influencing him to espouse the cause of the Fatherland. But surely, the editor against whom the

offense was committed could not prevent that. Moreover, the Allies did exactly the same thing. The Editor of AMERICA did not know he was on the German list, but he did know that he was on the lists of France and England. And not only did the literature of these latter nations come to AMERICA's office in abundance, but French and English gentlemen called frequently, before the war, throughout the period of the war, and after the war ended. All were received politely, they were gentlemen; all bore away the same knowledge, that until such time as the United States might enter the war, AMERICA would do its best to preserve absolute neutrality, in obedience to a rational public request of the President of the United States. After our entrance into the war, there was only one path to take, the path of absolute loyalty to the declared policy of the Government. That this was trod vigorously, everybody knows, even the Government, one of whose departments has written a gracious letter of thanks to the Editor, because AMERICA "has been one of the most helpful periodicals which this bureau has received during the past six or eight months."

The editor of AMERICA was thought important enough to be listed by a German: he was also thought important enough to be listed by French and English. This may or may not be an impertinence on the part of those who set his name down, but one thing is sure, it is not a charge against AMERICA, much less proof of a charge. If a thief lists men in order to investigate the possibility of robbing them, this scarcely constitutes even an indictment of the latter's probity.

Had the Editor known his name was on the German list of those who, as the press report says, were thought important by one individual, he would have protested, if possible, even though his name was placed there long before our entrance into the war. No doubt the Germans realized this, for, time and time again, they protested vigorously against what they termed "AMERICA's anti-Germanism": they protested singly and collectively, they protested in their own names and in the names of societies which they represented, they protested in letters and in their papers, they went so far as to register a complaint against the Editor of AMERICA, at the Austrian Embassy in Rome. This attitude is probably the reason why the Germans contented themselves with sending to this office occasional pieces of literature which, however, never found their way to the Editor, but were consigned to a waste-basket below stairs.

But one thing more need be added here; the German who tried to list the name of AMERICA and its Editor was so well acquainted with both, that he did not know the correct name either of the paper or of its Editor.

## Freedom for the World

THE President of the United States has gone abroad to secure "freedom for the world." God speed him, for liberty is a precious gift from Heaven, and the man



who helps nations to come into such a heritage is in truth an apostle. But will the President of the United States secure freedom for all people, none excepted, not even the Irish? Who can say? Does the President of the United States intend to make an attempt to secure freedom for all people, none excepted, not even the Irish? He has answered that question himself. In message after message he has declared for the self-determination of all nations, none excepted, not even Ireland. He called this country to war in the name of freedom for every nation, Ireland included: he kept the country at war for the same high purpose; he left our shores at a critical time to effect that high purpose, freedom for all peoples, the Irish included. Hence, even if he were tempted to waver in his resolve, an evil and gratuitous thought, he could not do so. He has committed himself to a policy beyond cavil or hope of escape. And why should people doubt Mr. Wilson's intention? Was not his father a simple Irish immigrant? He was, and blood always tells. The land of the President's paternal ancestry is as dear to Mr. Wilson as to the sons of other immigrants. And has not Ireland been oppressed for many a black and lean century? It has been oppressed, and Mr. Wilson goes to lift the burden from its racked and starved soul. No man should doubt the President's good-will; rather, results should be awaited in patience and judgment based on them.

True, the plan of the President of the United States will meet with bitter opposition from England. That is clear. The Allied conference sat in London recently and canvassed the world for problems to be discussed in Paris. The Poles, the Finns, the southern Slavs, the northern Slavs, the eastern Slavs, the western Slavs, the Kaiser, trade, indemnities, and other important and unimportant affairs and persons were discussed, but there was no word about Ireland. That looks bad, but then the President of the United States has gone abroad to secure freedom for all nations, Ireland included.

And there is a second obstacle to the accomplishment of Mr. Wilson's purpose. England is trumpeting freedom through the world. Her heralds turn to the north and call for liberty for Belgium, to the south and shout for freedom for Serbia, to the east and clamor for emancipation for Bohemia, to the west—their voices should fail them, for there at England's door, at the very moment that England is filling the whole world with cries of liberty, fraternity and equality, lies Ireland under martial law. And worse, while British heralds are trumpeting liberty to the world, British jails are sending out the mocking voices of Irishmen, imprisoned on Britain's alien soil these many months, not only without trial but without a charge. England is demanding freedom for all the world, Ireland excepted. President Wilson is demanding freedom for all the world, Ireland included. That is a difficult problem. The result will be awaited with more than interest and with firm hope that no one will be disappointed.

### Foch in the Hour of Victory

SOME months ago at least half the world gave Marshal Foch, by acclamation and common consent, the title of "the man of the hour." It was a tragic title, for it was fearful with awful responsibilities; it was a stupendously honorable title, for it meant that out of the hundreds of millions of men of the many nations arrayed against the Central Powers he had been judged the one man best fitted to save Europe and humanity. The hour has passed and with it much of the glamour of the title. Hereafter he will probably be designated as the man of history. For no man in all history ever faced so colossal a task, commanded so many troops, represented so many great Governments. He rose to the occasion, he fulfilled his trust, he defeated the enemy, he brought back peace. If ever a man deserved an undying place in history, that man is Ferdinand Foch.

On every side we are hearing of his military genius, his force of character, his steadfastness in defeat, his moderation in victory, his tireless activity, his calmness in personal loss, his attachment to his soldiers, his simplicity of life, and all those other qualities which his friend, Marcel Knecht, has described so graphically in a recent number of the *Independent*. But perhaps in all his great moments, and there have been many such, he never rose so high as when his spirit of Christian humility led him to deprecate any personal praise for his share in the final success, and to say that he deserved no thanks, because in the accomplishment of great things he had been merely an instrument in the hands of God.

This last trait in his character appeals especially to Catholics, who yield to none in their appreciation of his many claims to admiration, for it is another proof that Marshal Foch, like the majority of the great French generals, is still, as he has ever been, a fervent son of the Faith. As he turned in his time of anguish, during the dark days of the battle of the Yser, to the little chapel near his headquarters, there to find light and strength in meditation and prayer, so in the moment of supreme victory he made his way to another church, again near his headquarters, there to give thanks to the God of Hosts.

Cardinal Amette has put this fact on record in a very striking way, for in the course of his address in the Cathedral of Notre Dame during the *Te Deum* celebration on Alsace Day, he interrupted his discourse to read a letter which he had just received from the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied armies:

What a satisfaction it would be for me to join with you in chanting the *Te Deum* of thanksgiving in our old national basilica. I shall chant the *Te Deum* where I am at present, in the church near my headquarters, thus fulfilling in one and the same act my duty to God and my duty to my country.

Duty to his country kept him in the field; duty to God led him to the altar.

As M. Marcel Knecht exults with laudable pride, that Marshal Foch grew up as a youth in his "beloved city of Metz on the banks of the picturesque Moselle," and that

he "has always remained a Lorrainer in heart, if not by birth"; so the Society of Jesus will be pardoned if it also, with similar pride, points to the fact that this incomparable man of history received his educational training in the Jesuit College of St. Clement-les-Metz, and that like so many other heroes of the war, he is, in the common sense of the word, gloriously but none the less truly, a "Jesuit boy."

### The Corporations and State Ownership

**I**N his latest message, the President reminded Congress that the present Federal control of the railways terminates with the signing of the treaty of peace. He has no policy to suggest; he recognizes that the release of the roads would "stimulate private initiative," and while he does not definitely repudiate Government ownership, the undercurrent of his remarks seems to convey his belief that the country is not ready to accept that responsibility. It is no doubt true that a show of hands would reject any such assumption, at least, just at present. Most Americans are persuaded that the railways will, on the whole, be better administered by the private companies than by officials subject to political control. They further recognize the serious menace to republican institutions connected with Government ownership. An administration that set itself the task of complying with the demands of a few million railway employees, who at the same time are voters, might go a long way along the road of self-perpetuation. One way of avoiding this danger would be found in the expedient of depriving such employees of the vote, a condition which obtains among those other servants of the Government, soldiers of the regular army and marines. A better way, however, is to avoid Government ownership.

As the President implies, it would be a mistake to go back to the old conditions prevailing before the war. Unfortunately, just as the lawless saloon was probably the strongest factor in wrecking a legitimate business, so one of the most telling arguments against private ownership of public utilities is the rebellious and arrogant policy of many corporations, particularly the railways and local transit companies. Thus, according to Commissioner Kracke of the New York Public Service Commission, during the month ending November 30, a Brooklyn railway company was guilty of 41,036 infractions of orders issued by the Commission. This is the company on whose lines ninety persons were killed in a single accident in October. Its cool disregard of orders in the very month following this catastrophe, shows clearly that it, like many other corporations, will obey the law only when obedience jumps with its convenience.

The Commissioner proposes to draw the attention of the public prosecutor to the case, for like the philosopher who discovered his favorite cat making her bed in his favorite wig, he thinks this latest performance exhausts patience. A list of 41,036 infractions in one month does

seem rather excessive. If the corporations wish to play into the hands of Socialists, and of many who, though not Socialists, are bent on establishing municipal and Federal ownership, they have only to continue their present course.

### Charity or Indifferentism?

**O**NE among many good results of the United Drive is that Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Unitarians, and the rest of the brethren, have learned to know one another better. This is great gain, but not if from this cordial feeling a spirit of indifference to positive religion should spring up among Catholics. Religion, after all, implies faith as well as works, and it surely does not essentially consist in a willingness to engage in the corporal works of mercy. It was painful rather than amusing to listen to certain Catholic speakers, who should have known better, refer to the Catholic Church as a "sect," and talk as if those priests who went with the forces as Knights of Columbus chaplains, were fulfilling a priest's most sublime functions when they were distributing chocolate and cigarettes to the soldiers. Were these same facile gentlemen, stretched on a bed of sickness, to call for a priest, they well know that it is not a bar of chocolate, but the saving Sacraments that they would ask. No one probably is better acquainted with the legitimate needs of men, or more ready to minister to them, than the Catholic priest; but he is well aware that he was not set apart among men to amuse his flock, but to preach, offer the Adorable Sacrifice and administer the Sacraments. Our Catholic people know this, too, and nothing should be suffered which may lead them to another opinion.

The same unfortunate tendency was also noticeable in some of the advertisements authorized by the Committee. One in particular told with great cleverness of a Baptist clergyman who soon concluded that it was better to minister to the soldier's physical comforts than to his spiritual wants. Of course, "Doc holds services now and then," but they seem to be purely secondary. His chief occupation appears to be a kind of genteel and efficient sutlering. On solemn occasions he even distributes rosaries to the Catholic soldiers before he leads them in to prayer. Both he and the writer of the advertisement seem blissfully unaware that no Catholic may lawfully take part in a Protestant religious service. But what's the difference? "Doc—and indeed most of the padres at the front—have to rake their memories to tell what denomination was theirs before they took to this communion"; the communion in question being the holding of non-sectarian services and the apostolic ministry of distributing cigarettes.

When a tired soldier wants a cigarette or a doughnut, it does not make much difference whether the hand that supplies him is attached to a Unitarian or a Catholic. In his experience, there is no such thing as a Unitarian doughnut or a Baptist cigarette. But when religion is



sought for, there is all the difference in the world. As an Anglican chaplain recently wrote from the front, the soldiers do not want the chaplain to be "a man among men, but a man of God among men." This is particularly true of the Catholic soldier, but he has never yet found a Catholic priest wicked enough to tell him that he did not

know what was his denomination. It is hardly necessary to say that any Catholic priest, known to be such, guilty of that statement would incur excommunication, inasmuch as it would be equivalent to apostasy, in those cases in which it did not, rather, argue a disordered brain, excusing from culpability.

## Literature

### "LO, HERE A LITTLE VOLUME BUT GREAT BOOK"

**I**N an era of stupendous historical events it would perhaps be natural that the four-hundredth anniversary of the publication of a book should pass practically unnoticed. But when it is recalled that this book has gone into over 1,500 printed editions, that it has been translated into fifty different languages, that its diffusion is called by De Quincey "the most remarkable bibliographical fact on record"; that this book is in fact no other than the "*De Imitatione Christi*" of Thomas à Kempis, first published just 400 years ago, it will be conceded that such an oversight, howsoever natural, were most unfitting. "The world's own book," one of its commentators has called it, and this universal proprietorship is not the least of the phenomena associated with a work which, whatever else it is, is assuredly not of this world.

The "Imitation of Christ" was one of the fruits of a religious movement called the "New Devotion" which ran its course in Holland and Germany during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, and which seemed to renew the fervor of the primitive ages of faith, resulted in the foundation of communities of the Brothers and Sisters of the Common Life, and was an evidence of the Church's power to renew herself from within. So far from its being, as has been asserted, a forerunner of the Protestant Reformation, it was the strongest kind of argument against it, as showing along what lines reform could be undertaken and effected, and no jot or tittle of the deposit of Catholic and Apostolic faith so much as touched by an irreverent breath.

To the house of the Brothers of the Common Life in Deventer, where his elder brother John had been one of the community, came one day a thirteen-year-old boy, Thomas, the son of John and Gertrude Haemerken, of the town of Kempen in the diocese of Cologne, where in 1379 or 1380 he had been born. He found that his brother had gone to Windesheim as one of the founders of Mount St. Agnes, so the boy remained at Deventer under the care of Florentius, of whom he afterwards wrote: "He was a benefactor to me and to many others; he first launched me for the service of God, and in the fulness of time steered me for the monastery." The "fulness of time" was the year 1399, when, having completed his humanistic studies, Thomas à Kempis became an Augustinian canon at Mount St. Agnes. He became the chronicler of the monastery, writing its history down to 1471, the year of his own death, and there also, besides other devotional works and the lives of the Founders of the New Devotion, he wrote his "little volume but great book," the "Imitation of Christ," which was published at Cologne in 1418.

There have been many attempts to explain its universal appeal, which is second only to that of the revealed word of God. It is, of course, quite natural that its fervent accents should be recognized as their mother-tongue by those of the household of the Faith in communion with whom it was written, but there are those who will have none of Catholicism and who yet feed their souls upon a production which is the very marrow and fatness of Catholicism. Gladstone, for instance, not only read it

himself, but gave it to a Presbyterian friend, who "relished" it; and Gladstone wrote: "I do not believe it possible for anyone to read this book earnestly from its beginning and think of Popish or non-Popish, or of anything but the man whom it presents and brings to us"—a result far enough from the intention of the man so brought. Still another class who reject all dogma and pin such faith as they have to what they call religion of the heart, lump the "Imitation" with Seneca's "Morals" and the "Sayings" of Marcus Aurelius, as among the "scriptures" of this religion. Yet the "Imitation" not only accepts and embraces every doctrine of the Catholic Church, but is in itself strong doctrine. For the matter of that, à Kempis addressed himself, strictly speaking, to his fellow-religious, yet within the Church the reading of his book is by no means confined to the cloister. In its appeal to Catholics there is no distinction of state or circumstance or time, and for its interpretation there is no need of note or comment.

The "Imitation of Christ" answers to an inherent craving of the human heart, which sin itself often renders only more poignant, the craving for the Divine. It is a complete treatise in the heavenly science which seeks to develop this perception and further the satisfaction of this craving, a science to which has been given the name of mysticism—"merely a hard word," wrote Florence Nightingale, "for 'the kingdom of heaven is within.'" A Catholic writer has called it "the art of Divine union." A Kempis, of course, does not define it at all, does not so much as use the word, but, as he said of compunction, it is better to know the thing itself than to know how to define it, and in the four books of the "Imitation" he has so perfectly described the mystical life in all its phases and stages that the whole world has recognized the portrait.

A Kempis knew none but mystics because he knew none but Catholics. Groote and Florentius and the rest would have been at a loss to understand a spirituality that was not upheld by the framework of Catholic dogma as sinew and vein of the body are supported by the skeletal structure, that was not nourished by the Sacraments as the life of the body is nourished by bread. In the centuries that have intervened since then the cold breath of Protestantism has swept it into hiding, as it did the Mass, its supreme manifestation, but when à Kempis lived it was not considered indecent to pay public homage to the Most High, nor illogical so to live as though the Kingdom of Heaven in reality suffereth violence, and prayer and the Sacraments of the Church were the weapons that bear it away.

From this point the life of every practising Catholic is a mystical life, inasmuch as it has its origin in mysteries, feeds upon mysteries, tends to union with the supernal Mystery. Like the life of the body it has its stages of growth and development, corresponding as in the bodily life to childhood, youth and maturity. The mystic sees and seeks God in every part of the universe, but especially and intimately in the depths of his own soul. His whole life is an effort toward fuller perception of and closer participation with Him, and he is eager for whatsoever will assist him to this end. A Kempis discloses to him the secret; it is the *imitation of Christ*. He is to become so like

Christ that it shall be no longer he that lives but Christ that lives in him. He is to exchange his nature for Christ's nature, his heart for Christ's heart, his will for Christ's will, and, most difficult of all, his point of view for Christ's.

In the First Book, which corresponds roughly to the way of beginning, he exhorts the reader to conform his whole life to Christ, and urges him to enter upon the work of purgation, to begin the task of leveling the mountains and exalting the valleys, which is the preparation of the way of the Lord. How is this to be done? By weaning the heart from the love of visible things, which follows from a realization of the vanity of all save to love God and serve Him alone: "Let us lay the axe to the root, that being purged from passions we may possess our minds in peace." He is counseled to entertain a humble opinion of himself, and with the good-sense characteristic of all true spirituality, he is given solid reasons for so doing, while at the same time there is pointed out to him, if one may so speak of so lowly a virtue, the soaring altitudes of humanity. "Love to be despised and to be accounted as nothing." Somewhat later he is shown the delights of solitude and silence: "In silence and in quiet the devout soul maketh progress and learneth the hidden things of Scripture. . . . For whoso withdraweth himself from acquaintance and friends to him will God draw near with His holy angels."

Still in the beginner's way, the soul is reminded of the salutary Last Things, that "In a very little while all will be over here," that men will forget him sooner than he thinks; "Who will remember thee when thou art dead? and who will pray for thee? Do now, beloved, do now all thou canst." Next comes the consideration of the Judgment with a truly marvelous visualization of the contrasting fates of the just and sinners. He strikes again the note on which he began: "All therefore is vanity except to love God and serve Him only." The last chapter of this Book, "On the Fervent Amendment of Our Whole Life," is to some extent an echo of the first but it differs in this, that the amendment is not so much that of fresh conversion as of the renewal of fervor so frequently incumbent upon those who are already walking in the way of grace. He is reminded also of the goal he has set out to reach: "When a man hath arrived so far that he seeks his consolation from no created thing, then first doth he begin to taste what God is."

The keynote of Book II, as is the case with each of the others, is sounded in the words of Scripture with which it opens: "*The kingdom of Heaven is within you, saith the Lord.*" The soul, though still weighted with imperfections and constantly urged to put them off, is considered to have come to some relish of the spiritual life, the kingdom within, and he is stirred up to the acquirement of virtue and especially to that which is the source of all others, the love of God. "Christ," he is told—and there is no question here of Holy Communion—"will come to thee and will discover His consolation to thee if thou wilt prepare for Him a fit dwelling within thee. . . . Many are His visits to the man of interior life and sweet His communication with him." He is to cultivate a pure mind and a simple intention: "Simplicity aimeth at God, purity taketh hold of Him and tasteth Him. . . . A pure heart penetrates heaven and hell." Then comes the ineffably beautiful chapter "On Familiar Friendship with Jesus," the outpouring of a heart that had rested on the Breast of the Lord.

But the interior life is not all sweetness. When God gives consolation "receive it as His gift, not thy merit," and when it is taken away the soul is not to despair; "this is no new or strange thing to those who have known *the way of God.*" Moreover, he is to learn to bear not only deprivations and negative trials but he must gird himself to meet tribulation and carry the Cross. Here we come to the innermost secret of spirituality, that which distinguishes it forever from the indifference of stoicism and the hardness of the Orientals, namely, joy in suffer-

ing. A Kempis here points out to the mystic the "Royal Way of the Holy Cross" and proceeds to show that although there are other paths to the goal of his desires they are mere byways compared to this broad road of suffering, the king's highway, which was first trodden by the bleeding Feet of the King Himself. Here is no morbid seeking of pain for its own sake, but an enlightened realization that while Christ's drinking of the Chalice of His Passion would have been enough, had God so willed, to redeem us not only from sin, but from that consequence of sin which is suffering, to have withheld the Chalice from our lips would have been to leave us without a gage wherewith to learn the immeasurable measure of His love. Small wonder the praise of the Cross is a veritable psalm on his lips: "In the Cross is infusion of heavenly sweetness, in the Cross is strength of mind, in the Cross is joy of spirit." That he has in mind a definite progress in spiritual things is evident from this observation: "When thou shalt arrive thus far that tribulation shall become sweet to thee, and thou shalt relish it for the love of Christ then think that it is well with thee for thou hast found a paradise upon earth."

Book III is a commingling of enlightenment as to heavenly things and a foretaste of their enjoyment. From the first chapter, which dwells on "the breathings of the Divine whisper," to the final prayer for direction along the path of peace, the soul is taught the mysteries of Divine love, his eyes turning even more constantly than in the beginning to the consideration of his own defects. Now he is taught to pray for devotion, and now, having received it, "not to ponder it overmuch." Now he cries out, "Enlarge Thou me in love, that I may learn to taste with the interior mouth of the heart how sweet it is to love, and to be dissolved and to bathe in love, let me be possessed by love, mounting up above myself through excess of fervor and ecstasy," and now he petitions, "Have pity on me and draw me out of the mire." In this Book also it is no longer the disciple alone who speaks, but his Beloved answers him, counseling him against vain learning, against too much solicitude, against "the arrows of men's words," against searching into high matters, against dejection in desolation, and instructing him how he is to attain to union with God by imitation of Him: "Son, give up thyself and thou shalt find Me. . . . As to desire nothing in the world, so doth relinquishing thyself unite thee to God. . . . Follow Me. . . . I am the way which thou must follow, the truth which thou must believe, the life which thou must hope for. I am the way inviolable, the truth infallible, the life that has no end."

The Fourth Book, at which many strain who have had no difficulty in swallowing the other three, bristling though they are with Catholic doctrine, deals with that aspect of the mystical life which consists in the soul's relation with its Lord in the Sacrament of the Altar. The entire Book is a dialogue between the disciple and the Beloved, comparable in certain passages only to the Cantic of Canticles. It is curious that à Kempis, writing in an age when the Scriptures are asserted to have been "sealed up," calls the Bible and the Blessed Sacrament "the two tables set on either side in the storehouse of the Church." "The word of God is the light of my soul," he says, "and Thy Body is the breath of my life." It is not maintained that Holy Communion is the consummation of Divine union; "Thou comest that thou mayest be sanctified by Me and united to Me, that thou mayest receive new grace and be incited anew to amendment." So that even here, so close to the end, there is still question of growth and fresh beginning, increase of light and renewal of fervor: "O that with Thy presence, Thou wouldst set me all on fire, burn and transform me into Thyself, so that I may be made one spirit with Thee by the grace of internal union, and by the melting of ardent love." Truly they that eat Him shall yet hunger and they that drink Him shall yet thirst.

BLANCHE M. KELLY.



"O FELIX CULPA!"

Then gazed the wild wood dumb with awe,  
Staring with eyeballs opened wide,  
At one grown conscious of a law  
And lifted suddenly to pride.

The apex of creation in,  
His shame, creation, envious sees—  
Magnificently robed with sin,  
Knowing the roots of mysteries.

Hot-footed hurrying through the immense  
The winds their happy tidings tell,  
That man, exchanging innocence—  
And gladly! for the fires of hell,

Proves his long-boasted power to choose,  
To leave the good and take the ill;  
Free, with his soul to save or lose,  
By warrant of its royal will.

But hidden from the awestruck eyes,  
Which see the sentenced rebels go,  
Are those tall towers of Paradise  
Wherethrough exultant rumors blow;

Where seated at the council board  
The Three-in-One debate Their plan,  
The Incarnation of the Word,  
The sorrows of the Son of Man.

THEODORE MAYNARD.

REVIEWS

**La Vie Créatrice.** Esquisse d'une Philosophie Religieuse de la Vie Intérieure et de l'Action. Ire Partie L'Enquête Humaine. Par DOM HÉBRARD. Paris: Beauchesne. 7 fr. 50.

The title of this rather formidable-looking volume suggests activity and movement. The author is the apostle of action. But in order that action may be of the right and vital kind, he lays down the principle that it must have its root in the intellectual, and that it will not be exerted to its full force unless the intellectual convictions themselves be clear, true and sound. Catholic action especially will not be of the right kind unless it is the result of absolutely sound Catholic principles. We fail in conduct, he tells us, because we compromise with our ideas and our principles. If our personality would radiate and exert its influence in the right way, the source from which that action springs must be ample and powerful. The religion of many Catholics does not radiate this power, because the intellect itself lacks vitality and sap. There is a remedy to this intellectual decay, against all intellectual and moral anemia: creative life, dynamic life in the light of truth. As the methods of experience are, in a certain class of modern philosophers, those most in vogue, the author accepts them, at least as a fact, and looks to them to give the solution of the perplexing questions now agitating the world.

In following out this method the author leads us through twenty-two vigorous, interesting and suggestive chapters whose purpose is to solve that ever-recurring "Why" that faces the child, the young man and the old on the journey of life. He finds in this "Why" the germ of all science and philosophy. And in studying it he appeals to experience not that of the laboratory, but of life, a better and more comprehensive one. He asks us then to examine our sensations, intuitions, our reason, love, science, art and the religious problem. The last gives the solution which the author correctly states is the only one. Neither in the powers of his reason nor in the attractions of

love, nor in science, nor in art, topics which the author treats at full length, does man find his complete satisfaction. God only can appeal to the whole man. He alone can satisfy the yearnings of his nature.

It is impossible to take exception to the validity of the solution. But although the author has treated the subject solidly and learnedly, he has taken a rather circuitous route to prove it, and the multiplicity of divisions and subdivisions will be rather puzzling to the reader not accustomed to such scholastic divisions. From Bergson to James, and from Ollé-Laprune to Ravaisson and Renouvier, Dom Hébrard has read widely, and the copious citations made from these authors, strangely at times corroborate the teaching of Catholic philosophy.

J. C. R.

**Understanding South America.** By CLAYTON SEDGWICK COOPER. Illustrated. New York: George H. Doran. \$2.00.

Now that the war is over, every thoughtful American must realize the importance of our retaining and strengthening, in spite of keen European competition, the valuable commercial advantages we have been gaining in South America. So a number of books like Mr. Cooper's have lately been appearing, the frank purpose of which is to promote a better understanding between the United States and our Latin neighbors. The brusque and hustling American businessman is commonly regarded by the polite and leisurely South American as "one of the uncomfortable works of God," and until we learn to adapt ourselves better to Latin manners and methods our commercial success, Mr. Cooper warns us, will be very meagre. The South Americans naturally resent any assumption of racial superiority on our part—and be it added for the enlightenment of the author—of religious, also. For Mr. Cooper adopts the usual American Protestant attitude toward the religion of the Latins he visited, speaks of the "consecrated wafer," is fond of calling attention to the paucity of men worshipers in the churches, and gives the customary "press notices" sounding the praises of Protestant propaganda in South America. Assuming, as he does, that ours is a "Protestant country," perhaps if the author made a Sunday census of one of our cities' Protestant churches it would prove that the men's attendance is rather slack in our land too. It certainly will not promote a better "understanding" of South America to write as Mr. Cooper does about Catholicism there.

The author, however, pays many a well-merited tribute to the virtues and social graces of the nations he visited. He doubts whether "a better-mannered people can be found" than "among the best classes of Peruvians," he attests that "The women of South America are among the best wives and mothers in the world," finds that "There are never too many babies in a South American home," and is impressed by the piety, beauty and purity of both maidens and matrons. Mr. Cooper writes many an interesting page about the wealth, enterprise and prospects of the leading South American cities and shows what a rich commercial field the continent offers North Americans of "understanding."

W. D.

**Present-Day Warfare.** By CAPTAIN JACQUES ROUVIER. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.35.

This book tells the way soldiers fight, not as individuals, but as parts of the mass; not as heroes, but as cogs in a machine. In fact, it deals with the forces as huge instruments and gives interesting, if sometimes gruesome, descriptions regarding the death-dealing implements that modern warfare has called into being. It was well worth while, however, to tell us intimately of automatic rifles and machine guns and how they work and when. It adds to our information to recognize what those blessed words "barrage," "drum-fire" and the like mean, and the importance of that branch of military training known as "liaison." Those who have been curious to know why even the bravest

Germans have hesitated to come forward for bayonet fighting will learn the reason on reading this book.

How many delvers in war books on this present struggle understand what is meant by the "race to the sea," how it was run and who won the contest? How many kinds of artillery are there and when do they roar and when, if ever, are they silent? What measures are taken in making ready for a "defense," and what are the preparations for the "offense"? The magnitude of the work for both maneuvers, the numberless details to be attended to, the time it takes, the responsibility it involves, how each smallest army unit has its allotted task mapped out days before; this book tells civilians all about such things and many others, too, which are necessary nowadays for waging successful battle. The reader will learn from Captain Rouvier's volume how this war, differing in conditions from all others, called for changes, not only in tactics, but in modes of attack, in weapons. And he will learn it, briefly, it is true, and oftentimes crudely, but after a soldier's way, and the author is successful despite the almost unavoidable technical nature of his subject in making plain to laymen what modern warfare really means.

J. F.

**Alberta: Adventuress.** By PIERRE L'ERMITTE. With a Foreword by FRANÇOIS COPPÉE, of the Académie Française. Translation by JOHN HANNON. New York: Benziger Bros. \$1.35.

It remains true, from Virgil's day to ours, that twice blessed is the swain who knows the pleasures that surround him, whose eye is filled with the sight of friendly farms and happy homesteads, and whose heart is satisfied by the sound of tender triplets of bird, or wayward trebles of untouched childhood. Foolishly does one so cast by nature forsake this fortune for the flash of city-life in the hope that there he may win speedily to riches. Such is the wholesome and quite timely lesson that is taught by "Alberta: Adventuress," which, in its rural scenes, is reminiscent of the finest in Marmontel, and by its dramatic intensity baits the reader's interest as might a story by Gaboriau. Withal, it is well balanced and tends neither too much for excitement to external incidents, nor too little to the inner growth of characters to fail in emotion: pathos. In fact, it is vibrant throughout, and is also marked by a true Catholic tone. An improvement might be a more directive title, for Count Bruno's career, rather than Alberta's, seems paramount. Possibly, too, there should have been more subordination of the character Claude, and more abbreviation generally; though such notices smack much of insurgency against excellence. A. F. X. D.

#### BOOKS AND AUTHORS

In a pamphlet entitled "Chronology of the Life of Christ," written and published by the Rev. Francis Valitutti (36 White Street, Saratoga Springs, N. Y., \$0.30), he first rejects the chronology established by the Valentinians and the Basilidians, and then adopts and defends the opinion of St. Irenaeus, based, as he states, on the authority of the Gospel and the Elders, that Our Lord preached until He was fifty years of age. As Father Valitutti accepts A. D. 29 as the date of the Crucifixion, this places the Birth of Christ in the year 21 B. C. All will not accept this conclusion nor will all admit the exegesis of John 8:57, but none can fail to appreciate the scholarly way in which the author defends his thesis. The whole treatise is stimulating and one can see on every page that its writing was for the author a labor of love.

In "Canterbury Pilgrims and Their Ways" (Dodd, Mead, \$3.50), Francis Watt describes the career and the martyrdom of St. Thomas à Becket, his splendid thirteenth-century shrine, the roads the pilgrims took to reach it, how they behaved on the way and what acts of piety they performed on reaching the

Cathedral. He also describes modern Canterbury, with all its old landmarks. Though the author is not a Catholic, he tries hard to understand the psychology of the pre-Reformation Canterbury pilgrim, and on the whole with considerable success. The volume is well illustrated.—"By Eskimo Dog-Sled and Kayak" (Lippincott, \$1.50) is an account of a Protestant "missionary's experiences and adventures in Labrador" by Dr. S. K. Hutton, who was himself a part of all he saw. His readers are given a vivid picture of the hardships the author cheerfully bore, but regarding his success in evangelizing the natives there is very little said.

No one who is interested in Ireland's future should fail to secure a copy of the December 8 *Catholic Mind*. For Mr. Patrick E. Walsh contributes to it a paper which contains the remarkable speech that George Washington Parke Custis, Washington's adopted son, delivered at a meeting of American citizens held in Washington, July 20, 1826, for the purpose of transmitting a "consolatory address" to the people of Ireland. The speech is singularly applicable to the present state of Irish affairs. The orator, for instance, said:

If there is an American who does not feel for the wrongs of that country, which so nobly contributed to the establishment of our rights, I pronounce him recreant to the feelings of virtue, honor and gratitude. And my country's self, if she decline to give only her poor opinions of the miseries of those who gave their toil and blood that she might be great, free and happy, when misfortunes next assail her, may she not find the friend she once found in Ireland. This token will convey our greetings to Erin's distant sons, and when it arrives there they will exclaim, "There is yet a people who remember poor Ireland and who, rejoicing in their own rights, can feel for the wrongs of others." Let our scroll be inscribed: "From the Land of Liberty to the Land of Montgomery."

The second article in the number is the statement of "Ireland's Economic Condition," which Mr. J. L. Fawcitt, the Secretary of the Cork Industrial Development Association, made two months ago for a group of visiting American Bishops. He shows how poor the country is in man-power, produce, industries and transit facilities as a result of British misrule. Archbishop Ireland's admirable address on "The Duty of Divine Worship" is then offered as Advent reading.

The *St. Louis Catholic Historical Review*, issued quarterly under the editorship of the Rev. Charles L. Souvay, C.M., D.D., by the Catholic Historical Society of St. Louis, is the latest publication of its kind to appear. The initial number opens with a good sketch of the Historical Society by Father Rothensteimer, which is followed by an interesting account of the contents of the archdiocese's archives by Father Holweck. Many will no doubt be surprised to learn that Father Verhaegen, S.J., was the first name on an episcopal terna that Bishop Rosati made out in 1840 "for the selection of a successor in case he should not return from Europe." In the archives there are also four letters by Blessed Sophie Barat and a number by Venerable Madame Duchesne. Father O'Malley contributes an informing paper on "The Centenary of the Foundation of the St. Louis Diocesan Seminary," and the "Notes" which end the number are full of interesting reading. The *Review's* subscription price is \$2.00 a year.

Here are some new books for the little ones: "The Shining Ship and Other Verse for Children" (Doran, \$1.50), which Isabel E. Mackay has written and Thelma Cudlipp has illustrated in color and line, has much in it that will please. Stevenson's "Child's Garden" still stands alone, however. George Mirick has prepared for boys and girls a little book of "Home Life Around the World" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.25), which Burton



Holmes has suitably illustrated. Isabel Powers has gathered together for small readers "Stories the Iroquois Tell Their Children" (American Book Co.), and Joseph C. Sindelar narrates to an attentive young audience "Father Thrift's" Adventures with "His Animal Friends" (Beckly-Cardy Co., Chicago, \$0.50), and Helen G. Hodge makes the pictures. Mothers and teachers will be glad to know of Ann Macbeth's "Play-Work Book" (McBride, \$1.00), wherein directions are given for constructing a hundred simple things for work or play. Joseph C. Sindelar edits a little collection of "Merry Christmas Entertainments" (Beckly-Cardy, \$0.35) that mothers and teachers will also find useful, and William H. Allen and Clare Kleiser have compiled an interesting book of "Stories of Americans in the World War" (Institute for Public Service, New York, \$0.75).

The foreword of the anonymously written "Pastor Halloft" (Longmans, \$1.50) states that the chapters in the book "are true biography. They embody the principles and beliefs of a priest who carried them into action. Only the setting has been slightly altered from the original, in order to connect the incidents and give them consistency as a story." The author follows a zealous Swiss youth's career through an American seminary, describes his first experiences as a curate and then devotes the bulk of the volume to a detailed account of Father Halloft's failures and successes as pastor of what seems to be a town in the Pennsylvania coal regions. The book reads like a veracious history of how a resourceful priest faced and solved the numberless problems that confronted him during a long pastorate. The author's reflections on the sacerdotal life and his occasional shots at the cloth are sure to interest a wide circle of clerical readers. Though some of "Daddy Dan's" genial humor would have made "Pastor Halloft" more amiable, and he was far from consistent in accepting a title he seems to consider illegal, the book draws a portrait of a manly, priestly shepherd whose life was governed by high, supernatural principles.

Ford Madox Hueffer's recent volume, "On Heaven, and Poems Written on Active Service" (Lane, \$1.25) is a riot of rhymed and unrhymed free verse which it could not have cost him much trouble to write. The author's idea of "Heaven" is worthy of a Mohammedan. The best poem in the volume is "Footsloggers," which is full of patriotism and contains passages like this:

I don't know,  
In the breathless rush that it is of parades and drills,  
Of digging at the double and strafes and fatigues,  
These figures grow dimmed and lost:  
Doubtless we too, we too, when the years have receded,  
Shall look like the heroes of Hellas, upon a frieze,  
White-limbed and buoyant and passing the flame of the  
torches  
From hand to hand. . . . But today it's mud to the knees  
And khaki and khaki and khaki. . . .

These stanzas, "After the Italian of Dominici (1356-1420)" and entitled "Mother Most Powerful," were contributed to the *Ave Maria* by Roderick Gill:

That thou so often held Him in thine arms,  
So often pressed His infant lips to thine,  
And in thy bosom warded off the harms  
That came with flesh e'en to the Child Divine;

That thou hast clothed Him, felt Him cheek to cheek,  
In dreams and waking; in thine ear hast known  
His first lisped "Mother"; marked His soft hands seek  
Thine aid with glances cast on thee alone,—

That thou hast known such countless ecstasies  
Of love through that sweet hidden time of yore,  
And yet thy heart held strong, spite all of these,  
Shows thou wert mortal, Mother,—yea, and more!

## SOCIOLOGY

### Principles and the Practical Man

A CORRESPONDENT in AMERICA recently complained that Catholic writers on social questions failed to come to grips with really practical problems, but confined themselves to generalities and abstractions. Catholic writers, says this correspondent, are fond of declaiming about the great things that were done in the Middle Ages; they will speak, too, of the principles laid down in the Encyclical "*Rerum Novarum*," but they do not bring forward concrete and practical proposals. They will criticize the attempts of non-Catholics, but they will not tell us what solution of social problems the Church herself has to offer.

It is not my intention to argue that there is no ground for this complaint, but to offer a few comments on the relations between principles and practice. The Abbé Naudet, leader of the "Christian Democrat" school in France, has advocated the view of Brunetière that Catholicism is "not only a system of morals and theology, but also of sociology." Another French priest, who is a writer of note, Père Schwalm, O.P., dissents from Abbé Naudet and Brunetière, and speaking of their opinion, says:

This teaching, though certainly very pious in intention, is a formal error; the Church has not for its proper and immediate end to procure for men their happiness in this life; nor is it for the Church to undertake the organization of temporal society whose proper end it is to secure such temporal welfare.

The contrast between these two views is very suggestive if we would consider it, but it is not precisely the point to be discussed in this article.

### THE VALUE OF A PRINCIPLE

IS the setting forth of a principle any practical help to the improvement of conditions? We may admit that to state a principle does not by itself improve material conditions; and it follows that if Catholic writers do no more than set forth principles they fail to do all that needs to be done. The principle must not only be set forth, but accepted, and not only accepted, but also applied. But is the setting forth of a principle of any practical value; is it one of the necessary steps to the goal of real improvement of concrete conditions?

To speak of the relations between principle and practice, it will be best to take, not principles in general, but one particular principle. We may take the principle of the living wage, as formulated by Pope Leo XIII in the "*Rerum Novarum*." Without claiming that Leo was the original expounder of this principle, we may fairly say that it is distinctively a Catholic contribution to social thought. Perhaps we are all a little tired of hearing about the principle of the living wage; it has become platitudinous, and therefore we hold it cheap, like water and air. Everybody assents to it, "in theory," and the only question now is the means of putting it into effect. Supposing there really is a universal theoretical assent to the principle, and that it is no longer useful to set forth the principle, surely the practical man will admit that a necessary initial step has been taken. It is practical to have your object made clear and to secure agreement among those concerned, as to what should be their object. "Yes," the practical man will say, "but who would dream of disputing the theory of the living wage? To preach that principle is to force an open door." It would be possible to quote some of the most approved of present-day economists in America to show that they do not accept the principle of the living wage. They consider it unscientific.

### A REAL CONTRIBUTION

BUT if we go back to the year 1891 when the "*Rerum Novarum*" was written, we find that the Pope in laying down the principle of the living wage was uttering rather a

paradox than a platitude. He was flying in the face of the economic orthodoxy of the day. The Ricardian school was still ascendant, and though "*laissez faire*" had been abandoned by governments dependent on untutored popular electorates, it still held the allegiance of the experts. Much was said in criticism of the Encyclical on its appearance, but no one said its most famous feature was platitudinous. Perhaps the statement cannot be proved, yet I submit that the present widespread acceptance of the principle of the laborer's right to a living wage is due in no small part to Catholic advocacy since 1891.

The Catholic contribution to social thought on this question does not end with the propagation of Pope Leo's ethical statement of the case. The principle had to be set forth in concrete terms. What was a living wage? What were the actual commodities needed by the laborer for a proper livelihood? How many rooms should he have in his house for the minimum of proper accommodation? What should he be able to claim and enjoy in the way of food, clothing, recreation, education? Considering the actual conditions in America today, considering the varying prices of commodities in different parts of the country, what was the amount of money that would represent a living wage? The practical man will agree that it is of practical importance to answer these questions.

#### SOME DEFINITE SETTLEMENTS?

A FURTHER question to settle, in view of the prevailing conditions of expert thought, was whether interference with the competitive determination of wages would have an injurious reaction on industry. Was it possible to increase wages at the expense of the other shares of production, rent, interest and profits? Whether the practical man will appreciate the importance of this last inquiry I am not certain, but all students will assure him that it is important. Now all these practical questions as to the application of the principle of the living wage have been studied and answered pre-eminently by Catholic writers. Non-Catholic students will be the first to say that the most thorough discussion of the living wage from the standpoint of economic science is the work of an American Catholic, Dr. Ryan. So far as an advance has been made in the direction of the living wage, it has been largely under Catholic leadership. We have done far more than to set forth abstractions and generalities.

When we are agreed that the living wage is our end we have to settle means. Should it be established by legal enactment or by labor-union action, or by consumers' action, or by a combination of these means? Are minimum-wage laws to be made by Congress or by State legislatures, assuming we decide that legal enactment is a practicable means to our end? Catholics should certainly endeavor to work out these answers, but evidently they will never be the Church's answers. The Church cannot be called upon to draft acts of Congress or State legislatures dealing with industrial regulation. We must not expect a social program from the Church as a cut-and-dried scheme.

#### PRINCIPLE LEADS TO PRACTICE

THE Church lays down principles for our guidance as to ends to attain, and it is for us to decide upon the means. Enough has been said to show that in setting forth the principle of the living wage, Leo XIII did give a lead that has brought us progress, and Catholics acting under his inspiration have done much to solve the practical problems. Perhaps we should make greater progress in the application of the principle of the living wage if we did not take that principle too easily for granted; in other words, if we had a real understanding of what is meant by claiming for the laborer a living wage as a *natural right*. Perhaps the root of our deficiencies is not that we have only the principle and nothing more, but that we have not even so much. To many, the living wage is only a form of words.

Those who really grasp it as a principle are striving to work out its practical applications, as Dr. Ryan has done through his writings, and Father Edwin V. O'Hara, who carried to the Supreme Court the question of the constitutionality of the Oregon Minimum Wage Law when it was challenged by the employers.

HENRY SOMERVILLE.

## EDUCATION

### Greek on the Low Road

IN pre-war times, defenders of Greek studies traveled so much along the high *a-priori* road of reasoning that they wore it full of ruts. Their arguments all converged, with whatever logical abruptness, into the general form of a syllogism like this: whoever studies Greek ought to be cultured. You study Greek, consequently you ought to become cultured. But nobody has ever been converted by a syllogism any more than by the reiterated mumbling of a biological phrase like "survival of the fittest." What ought to be, never can compete with what is or has been; pale possibility is no match for ruddy actuality. It is time, then, in view of the after-the-war reconstruction of education, to consider arguments for Greek that desert the high *a-priori* road and take to the low, but safe road of inductive reasoning, of facts, of particulars instead of universals.

I believe that the most cogent reason for retaining Greek and of reinstating it where it has been dropped, is its value in teaching, not any abstract "culture," but English literature. And I appeal to the facts of history, written in the record of modern English prose and poetry.

#### THE POETS AND GREEK

PRACTICALLY every great name in nineteenth-century English belongs to a man who knew Greek at first-hand. To take the poets first. Shelley's poetry is so saturated with Greek ideas, phrases, and imagery, that, had he not written in English, he might be called without much exaggeration, a Greek classic. Coleridge was almost as familiar with the Greek tragedians as with Shakespeare. Browning had such a perfect knowledge of Euripides that his translation of the *Alcestis* is an English classic. Wordsworth's most famous poem, on the "Intimations of Immortality," is based on a distinctively Greek doctrine, Plato's theory of the pre-existence of souls. Tennyson's poetry discovers his accurate, though by no means wide, knowledge of Greek. Aubrey de Vere's "Search After Proserpine" was impossible to a poet ignorant of Greek. Matthew Arnold was perhaps the greatest critical reader and interpreter of Homer in the nineteenth century, as his essay "On Translating Homer" shows. Dante Gabriel Rossetti was at least moderately furnished with Greek. It cannot be denied that Swinburne's artistic form is a product of his Greek studies, however much it may be deplored that he tried to revive the out-worn immoralities of the Greeks, instead of those elements in Greek literature that Newman considered a preparation for the Gospel. Newman's "Essay on Aristotle's Poetics" reveals the fact that he was as much at home with classic, as with patristic Greek authors. Byron's deep realization of the spirit of ancient Greece, gained from its classics, drove him to help modern Greece regain its independence. The poetry of Lionel Johnson and Francis Thompson is rich with the spoils of the Greeks. When Thompson was a homeless wanderer on London streets he had two books, Aeschylus and Blake. Keats is the one great poet of the century past who got his knowledge of Greek from translations, and in his case we may fairly say *Exceptio probat regulam*.

#### THE MASTERS OF PROSE

THE same story of first-hand knowledge of Greek confronts us in reading the prose artists of modern English. Lord Macaulay read more Greek in a year than the average teacher



of Greek reads in ten years. Walter Savage Landor has been aptly characterized by Swinburne in two lines:

"And through the trumpet of a child of Rome  
Rang the pure music of the flutes of Greece."

The reader of De Quincey's "Confessions of an Opium Eater" recalls how one of his schoolmasters remarked: "There is a boy who could harangue an Athenian mob better than you or I an English one," or he remembers how De Quincey ran away from school with nothing to companion him but a text of Euripides. Pater's finest work is the product of his Greek studies. Newman's consummate mastery of Greek is displayed in his translation of St. Athanasius. Carlyle, Ruskin, Charles Lamb, Matthew Arnold, Keble, Froude, De Vere, Emerson, Francis Thompson, Lionel Johnson were first-hand students of Greek. In short the makers of modern English prose and poetry were in direct and intimate contact with Greek models of style and thought.

Those who travel on the low road of facts, of inductive reasoning, will gather two conclusions from the aforesaid facts: first, that a student of English literature who is ignorant of Greek will have no difficulty in misunderstanding a good part of the thought in his reading; second, that first-hand knowledge of Greek must have not a casual, but a causal connection with excellence in English prose and poetry. I cannot refrain from confirming these two conclusions by quoting the last paragraph of a book-review by Professor Goodell in the *Yale Review*:

As teachers of English literature realize the hopelessness of getting any proper understanding of it on the part of students who know no Greek, they feel driven to desperate efforts to fill the gap as best they can. Hence the courses in ancient "masterpieces in standard English translations." . . . A Greek teacher must sincerely condole with his friendly colleagues and wish them success. But in trying to impart an understanding of Hellenism to those who know no Greek, they are facing an impossible task. The best teachers of English are well aware of this, but are doing what they can. And it is in no unfriendly spirit if one points out a serious danger in this attempt. Is it not almost inevitable that such courses should cultivate in the student the habit of being content with second-hand knowledge? The famous books that have so profoundly influenced English authors are read only in translation; here is a volume of opinions about the Greek genius and its influence, part of them translated from French and German, opinions, therefore, coming to the student at second or third-hand about a literature that he is reading at second-hand. All this is dead against the first principle of scholarship, that of going straight to the primary sources. No one who is unwilling to learn Greek is fit to be dubbed a doctor in English, and set to teaching in college.

#### THE ETERNAL "PRACTICAL SUBJECTS"

THE obvious objection to the line of argument followed above will come from your practical, efficiency-crazed individual. He will say: "But recollect that we have just concluded a great war. The colleges must continue to foster young men for practical ideals. And a knowledge of Greek or English is not able to sight a rifle or calculate the angle of an enemy emplacement, or fit a boy for the hard realities of life. What we want is physics and chemistry and engineering, and *practical subjects*." I freely admit that physics, mathematics and chemistry are more effective studies for a warrior than any study of literature. But it is just as well to remind Mr. Practical Man that war or preparation for war is not the normal state of our nation. Peace is the normal environment of our college education and it is this which should be taken into first account in planning the reconstruction of college education. If this fact is forgotten there is danger that educators obsessed by the directly practical results aimed at and obtained by mathematics and physics, may fall into the very error they condemn as Prussianism, the error of militarizing the entire school system from the kindergarten up, by prescribing studies that directly foster military efficiency.

A. G. BRICKEL, S.J.

## NOTE AND COMMENT

### The Three Little Kyries

THIS is how the *Kyrie* appeared to the imagination of the editor of the *Catholic Herald of India* on his visit to one of the local churches during a rehearsal for a High Mass:

Three little Kyries, like three Japanese maids, came tripping down the sanctuary, bowed gracefully and forthwith proceeded each in turn to dance a Japanese jig. Then the maidens combined and became slightly more frantic, bounding and curveting as Japanese maids can do. After this trio, there rushed in from every corner a crowd of little *Kyries*, the whole of the Mikado's pagan nursery room let loose, caracoling, tumbling over each other, piling up to the ceiling and collapsing to the floor with fairylike agility, a regular pandemonium of sighs and shrieks, an unmitigated piece of musical blasphemy.

And please note that *Kyrie eleison* means "Lord, have pity on me!" We fear there is no hope of reform till we have a diocesan commission with powers to veto any music of the bioscope-show type.

All this happened in Calcutta. It never happens elsewhere.

### Mary Lyon's Precepts

IN his excellent study of Mary Lyon, the founder of Mt. Holyoke College, which Gamaliel Bradford contributes to the current *Atlantic Monthly*, he quotes, or paraphrases, from her writings or from the reminiscences of her pupils a number of aphorisms that today's teachers and educators could profitably make their own. For example:

Education is to fit one to do good. Our happiness lies largely in remembering; do what will be pleasant to remember. Whatever you do put life into it; learn to sit with energy. More than nine-tenths of the suffering we endure is because those around us do not show that regard for us which we think they ought to do. Live with high ideas; our thoughts have the same effect on us as the company we keep. Knowledge and reflection should balance. Live for God and do something.

That last precept especially was the one which Mary Lyon, in season and out, hammered into the girls committed to her care. She was an old-fashioned Protestant who believed that when Our Lord said that the wicked would be punished with "everlasting fire" He actually meant everlasting fire. As for those "purely ornamental" women who live useless, frivolous lives, she tried to make her pupils scorn such careers as much as she herself did.

### From War Conscience to World Conscience

A VIGOROUS food conservation campaign for "world relief" has been begun by the United States Food Administration. The same populations must be fed now as before the war and new countries have been added that look to us to save them from famine, or even from worse evils that might follow. The situation is thus officially set before us:

The change in the foreign situation necessarily alters the details of our food program, because the freeing of the seas from the submarine menace renders accessible the wheat supplies of India, Australia and the Argentine. The total food demand upon the United States is not diminished, however. On the contrary, it is increased. In addition to supplying those to whom we are already pledged, we now have the splendid opportunity and obligation of meeting the needs of those millions of people in the hitherto occupied territories who are facing actual starvation. The people of Belgium, Northern France, Serbia, Roumania, Montenegro, Poland, Russia and Armenia rely upon America for immediate aid. We must also participate in the preservation of the newly-liberated nations in Austria; nor can we ignore the effect on the future world developments of a famine condition among those other people whom we have recently released from our enemies. All these considerations mean that upwards of 200,000,000 people, in addition to those we are already pledged to serve, are now looking to us in their misery and famine.

The new appeal, we are told by Mr. Hoover, is no longer to the "war conscience" but to the "world conscience" of our people.

#### Every Catholic's Contribution to Catholic History

A STRONG appeal is made to the Protestant churches, by the Religious Publicity Service of the Federal Churches of Christ in America, to gather and preserve their records of war work. A questionnaire will be sent out for this purpose to the pastors and rectors of this Protestant churches throughout the country. We cannot insist too much, in this connection, upon the necessity on our own part of paying heed to the exceedingly pressing appeal made to all Catholics, and not merely to the pastors and heads of Catholic institutions, by the National Catholic War Council. No item of Catholic war news should be overlooked or not duly preserved in our records:

The National Committee on Historical Records has been directed by the Administrative Committee of Bishops to use every means possible for the purpose of securing an accurate and complete record of all Catholic American activity in the present war. This aspect of the National Catholic War Council cannot be too strongly emphasized. Unless we make provision for the history of Catholic patriotism and effort in this war we shall be guilty of a neglect which can never be remedied and of a mistake which can never be retrieved. If we fail to establish authentic records of our civic and religious activities, and if we fail to record all the noble work being done by American Catholics we are robbing the Church of the future of inspiration, of example and interpretation. History cannot be written on the day on which it is made, and the object of the National Committee on Historical Records is to collect for careful preservation every record and document which tells the story of Catholic activity.

Every contribution made will count for the honor of the Church and of the country in the compilation of the National Catholic War Records. Communications of this nature should be addressed to the Secretary of the National Committee on Historic Research, the Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday, 932 Fourteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. Letters from parents and relatives of soldiers, clippings from local newspapers, accounts of meetings held for war purposes, photographs and all similar historical matter will gladly be accepted by the Committee. Every Catholic is urged to contribute to the history of the Church's activity in the war.

#### A Romance of Christian Heroism

REFERENCE has already been made in AMERICA to the consoling message sent by the Holy Father to the exiled Mexican Archbishop Orozco, now helping in the duties of a little suburban parish of Chicago. The persecution inflicted upon him by the Mexican Government, without any assignable reason, and the fortitude of soul with which he bore his trials, make of his life a true romance of Christian heroism. It will suffice to quote a single instance taken from a very interesting account written by the Right Rev. A. E. Burke, P.A., for the December number of the *Extension Magazine*. Driven from Mexico by the cruelty and injustice of the robber Government, Archbishop Orozco at first sailed for Europe to protest against the murders and outrages from which his nation was suffering. This duty done, he bravely determined, at the risk of liberty or life, to re-enter his own diocese.

The joy which his presence again afforded to his devoted flock was intense, and only tempered by the fear that he might fall into the hands of the Carranzista soldiers whom all knew to be persistently on his track, although he had never done anything to merit such treatment. Quietly communicating with his officials he secreted himself in one remote mountain fastness or another, only coming forth when faithful friends apprised him that it was safe to exercise his episcopal functions in the smaller parishes adjacent to his retreat. For five months he was hidden in one of

these recesses, and for three months in another. The mountaineers are, perhaps, the poorest of the peoples of Mexico, but they are rich in the love of God, which surpasses all earthly possession, and full of charity for His representative amongst them; so they readily did whatever tender piety and unqualified devotion could suggest for his comfort, going even as far as to construct, with infinite pains and full hearts, a chapel where he could decently celebrate the Divine Mysteries, and a workroom where he might repose in safety by night and give himself to the administration of his diocese by day. A sentinel always stood at the mouth of the defile to watch for enemy approaches, so the Bishop could abandon himself to his devotions and the preparation of disciplinary letters without fear. Never in one single instance did those rude mountain dwellers divulge the secret of his hiding place, or utter even his name to anyone without their own little community. Not even the penal days in Ireland afford us examples of greater fidelity than this. And the holy Bishop in these remote surroundings, and partaking of the simple nourishment those poor people could afford, was perfectly happy and awaited with patience the day when he might be free and unhampered to move amongst his spiritual children and administer to them the rites and Sacraments entrusted to his hands for their sanctification.

Yet this was only the beginning of still greater persecutions endured for the name of Christ. Is it not high time that the nations of the earth should effectively protest against a regime of tyranny and barbarism unequalled in recent times except by the rule in Armenia of the unspeakable Turk?

#### The Christ Child's Own Favorite Work

THE Holy Childhood Association is seeking to raise for its diamond jubilee year the modest sum of \$100,000 as the contribution of the Catholics of the United States to its great cause. When we remember that during 1917, amid the distress of the war, France alone donated \$144,232 to this Association to carry on its wonderful work in the heathen world, we realize what small reliance is placed upon us and how far we still are from taking our proper place among the missionary nations of the world. Yet the time is coming when we shall square our shoulders for this task and show that we are ready to do no less for the propagation of Christianity than we were willing to do for the safeguarding of democracy. At present some 600,000 children are brought up in the orphanages conducted by the Holy Childhood in pagan lands. Their support and instruction is but a part of the great work accomplished by this Catholic organization which yearly secures the Baptism of hundreds of thousands of castaway children and fills Heaven with the souls of these little ones. As a single illustration of the activities of the Holy Childhood we quote here from a letter written by Bishop Van Dyck, Vicar-Apostolic of Salatsi, China:

The Holy Childhood is in no part of China more flourishing than in our Mission of S. W. Mongolia. Because the inhabitants are very poor, we collect more than 600 children every year. About half of that number die after they receive Baptism, and go to Heaven to pray for their benefactors. For the others we must seek nurses till they reach the age of four or five years, when they are brought into our orphanages. We have now 1,293 children in our orphan-houses, and 1,208 are placed with nurses; while more than 300 children have been adopted by Christians.

Nowhere in China is the practice of murdering children so general as in our mission. When the first child of a family is a girl, it is generally rejected. The richest families rarely have more than one girl, and our orphanages are not filled with the outcasts of the poor, but we find there children of the wealthiest families.

The sum which the Holy Childhood was able to allot last year for the work here described was \$2,000, or less than one dollar to clothe and feed a child for a year. War Savings Stamps and Liberty Bonds will help greatly in building up a reserve fund for the missionary labors of the Holy Childhood, but every donation, great or small, will be welcomed for the little pagan children, saved through our assistance in the name of the Christ Child. The sum of \$5.00 "buys a heathen child."